The Lies about Muhammad

How You Were Deceived Into Islamophobia

MOUSTAFA ZAYED

REFUTING THE LIES ABOUT MUHAMMAD AND ISLAM

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

"In the name of Allah, the most gracious, the most merciful"

The Lies About Muhammad

The Lies About Muhammad

An Answer to the Robert Spencer book "The Truth About Muhammad"

Moustafa Zayed

Table of Contents

Dedication.....11

Why This Book.....14

Preface.....16

Chapter One (28)

- Why a Biography of Muhammad is Relevant Today.....28
- "Death to Blasphemy".....35
- "Defending Freedom of Speech".....36
- "General Notes".....36

Chapter Two (38)

- "Hadith".....40
- "Historical Fact and Muslim Belief".....44

Chapter Three (49)

- "Khadija".....56
- The Suicidal Despair Returns.....61

Chapter Four (66)

- "Muhammad Revelations and Their Sources".....66
- "Borrowings from Judaism".....71

- "Dissimilarities in the Quran".....73
- "Tales of the Ancients".....78
- "Borrowings from Christianity".....85
- "The Crucifixion".....93
- "Other Borrowings".....97
- "Revelations of Convenience".....100
- "The Consequences".....112
- "Modern Embarrassment".....118

Chapter Five (125)

- "The Satanic Verses".....136
- "The Night Journey".....138

Chapter Six (144)

- "The Covenant Between the Muslims and the Jews".....146
- "The Conversion with Abdullah and Tensions with the Rabbis".....148
- "The Hypocrites".....152
- "The Nakhla Raid".....154
- "The Break with the Jews and the Change of Qiblah (Direction for Prayer)".....160

Chapter Seven (169)

- "War is Deceit"……169
- "The Battle of Badr"……169
- "The Problem of Booty"……178
- The Issue of the Captives of Badr……181
- God Blames Some Muslims……183
- "The Qaynuqa Jews"……185
- "Anger Towards Jews and Christians"……190
- "Assassination and Deceit"……191
- "The Quraysh Strike Back"……195
- About Wahshy……199
- "Assuaging Doubts after Uhud"……200
- "The Deportation of Banu Nadir"……204

Chapter Eight (213)

- "The Battle of the Trench"……215
- "Dealing with the Banu Qurayzah"…… 224
- "Finding Excuses for a Massacre"……234
- "The Women of the Banu Mustaliq"……238
- Battle of Banu Mustaliq……246
- "Abdullah Ibn Ubayy and Praying for One's Enemies"……246
- "The Treaty of Hudaybiyya"……247

- "The Raid at Khaybar"……249
- "The Poisoning of Muhammad"……258
- "The Spoils of Khaybar"……259

Chapter Nine (262)

- "The Conquest of Mecca"……262
- "Apostates to Be Killed"……268
- Arabic Story of Abdullah Ibn Saad……271
- "Muhammad at the Kabaa"……277
- "The Battle of Hunayn and Mastery of Arabia"……278
- "Invitation to Islam"……283
- "The Tabuk Raid"……292
- "Collecting the Jizya"……307
- "The Last Pilgrimage, The Rights of Women, and The Expulsion of The Pagans"……311
- "The Murder of the Poets"……316
- "Muhammad Final Illness"……316
- "After Muhammad"……324

Chapter Ten (330)

- 'The War on Terror"……330
- "Pedophile Prophet?"……332
- "Misogynist?"……336

- "Draconian Punishments?".....341
- "Warrior Prophet?".....346
- "Islamic Tolerance?".....349
- "A Kinder, Gentler Muhammad".....359
- "The Veneration of Muhammad".....363
- "Imitating Muhammad Today".....368
- "Frightening Reality".....372
- "What is to be done".....376
- Finally: Stealth Facism.....387

Index of Answers to Allegations (390)

- Muhammad and His Experiences.....390
- Muhammad and Quraysh.....391
- Islam/Muhammad and War.....392
- The Quran.....393
- Male Superiority.....395
- Muslims and Jews.....395
- Hadeeth and Scholars.....396
- Islam and Other Abrahamic Religions.....397
- Jihad.....398
- Non-Muslims Under Islamic Law.....398
- Islam Today.....399

This book is about the truth, the truth that always enlightens and guides to the straight path.

If this book does so for you, please thank Allah, the one mighty God, for the woman who I owe everything to: My late mother who had always been the blessing of Allah upon me.

I dedicate this book to her.

I miss her greatly.

Moustafa Zayed

Appreciation

The author would like to express his deepest appreciation to:

Mr. El Sayed Maaty, senior translation reviser of the UN for his most valuable help editing this book.

M. Zayed, for her limitless support in every aspect of producing this book cover to cover.

S. Zayed, for her meticulous care and review for details.

May Allah give them the best reward of helping bring the truth of his religion and his prophet, and for helping me personally.

Moustafa Zayed

"Allah does not forbid you to deal justly and kindly with those who did not fight you for your religion and did not drive you out of your homes. Verily, Allah loves those who deal justly" [8]

"It is only in regards to those who fought you for your religion, have driven you out of your homes, and helped to drive you out, that Allah forbids you to take them as allies. And whoever takes them as Allies, then those are the oppressors" [9]

Holy Quran, Surat (Al Mumtahina) Ch (60), verses (8-9)

لَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُوكُمْ مِنْ دِيَارِكُمْ أَنْ تَبَرُّوهُمْ وَتُقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ (8)

إِنَّمَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ قَاتَلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَأَخْرَجُوكُمْ مِنْ دِيَارِكُمْ وَظَاهَرُوا عَلَىٰ إِخْرَاجِكُمْ أَنْ تَوَلَّوْهُمْ ۚ وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ (9)

I could have gathered all the known fabrications and lies about Islam or Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and answered them one after the other in an indexed way. Why choose the Robert Spencer book "The Truth About Muhammad" to answer and refute its claims and accusations, page by page and paragraph by paragraph?

I wanted to show how far the intentional fabrications against everything Muslim have gone, and in details of its process and how it is done.

I wanted to demonstrate how parts or full Holy Quran verses are omitted when their translations don't fit the author's Allegations, how only well-known fabrications and unreliable sources are used to support the most extreme of opinions, and worse, how sometimes zero evidence whatsoever is the basis of the weirdest of claims.

This is not some difference in opinions, tastes, or clash of cultures, but deliberate fabrications, relying mostly upon well- known untrue stories and a myriad of the weirdest illogical conclusions.

It is all, however, means to an end. How convenient it is to fabricate the weakest connection between a minority I hate and some horrible crime, and then provoke the court of public opinion to execute that minority for me!

By reading what Mr. Spencer is ringing the alarming bells for, you would think that the Iraqis had already occupied Miami, Afghanistan is wreaking havoc in California, while the Palestinian war machinery is crushing the bones of the poor children of Poland and Germany!

My contention here is not that Mr. Spencer is an incapable writer, quite the contrary, he is, and I might add, he is very creative as well! Only I question if he is an advertiser who doesn't care how defectively dangerous the product he is fiercely marketing to people is, since it may be a lucrative piece of business to him.

But as a proud Muslim American myself, this defective product is not some bad-tasting brand of gum, but the same propaganda of the fascist anti-anything-Muslim, and hate-mongering propaganda that set up my American people to have our treasury pillaged for trillions of dollars

paying for a fictitious war against a country that had done nothing to us; a war that is still going with hundreds of thousands of innocent civilian victims most of which are Muslims. This is hate mongering that puts America on a clash course with one quarter of the population of the planet.

Today it is the Muslims, tomorrow it will be the Chinese, the day after tomorrow it will be World War Three fought with just sticks!

All along we were paying the trillions, are paying the trillions, and if not awakened, will still be paying the trillions.

Find out for yourself why it is done, how it is done… just once!

Moustafa Zayed

Preface

Whoever you are, I am inviting you to tap into your common sense and to be just and fair, as simple as that. Fairness is crucial, because the task at hand is to uncover if Robert Spencer, as a leading representative of the "let's hate anything Muslim" tide, is truthful, objective, and unbiased, or the total opposite.

If I have 100 dollars in cash and 40 in debts, and you asked about my financial well being, and someone answered, "He owes 40 dollars," then he certainly misled you even though he has stated a fact.

However, if I owe not one penny and someone claims repeatedly that I have nothing but debts, then our subject case gets in the absurdity mode. I don't want to ruin your conclusions, but to sum up Robert Spencer's claims about Islam in one simple analogy:
"Shaquille O'Neal is such a poor, short, white guy!"

In a religion where the last Prophet of God (PBUH) set the condition for believers to enter paradise to:
"**Spread peace amongst yourselves,**" our author, with laughable logic, statements conjured up out of thin air, and questionable sources, can see nothing but hatred and violence in Islam.

The same last Prophet of God, who made the greatest act of mercy in the history of mankind by forgiving the entire city of Mecca including the Pagans and their leaders who killed, tortured and starved his companions while relentlessly conspiring to kill him.

The same Prophet who would kneel down to tilt a pot of water till a cat finished drinking, and forbade his followers to have stand-still conversations while imposing their weights on the backs of their horses.

The same Prophet of God who invited the local Christians to perform their prayers inside his Mosque and guaranteed the repairing of their churches out of the Muslim's treasury, is the same Prophet Mr. Spencer described by his book subtitled "Founder of the world's most intolerant religion"!

But when we will refute the author's claims; we will not do that by just stating our opinion, since it is not about my individual ideology against his. We will bring evidence from the most reliable and accurate sources of the Prophet's quotation, Islamic history, and history in general. But most surely, in addition, we will even use basic logic to show the reader the absolute and known truths to the average Muslim that Mr. Spencer denies his readers. Yet, still not only our logic but that, and the testimony of some of the brightest thinkers in the history of the West as well.

After Muslim scholars have founded the science of verifying testable evidence by which we know which quotations of the Prophet and his biography are doubtlessly correct and which ones are not, miraculously Mr. Spencer picks the well-known, fabricated ones out of Ibn Ishaq, and ignores the main 6 trusted references of the Prophet's quotations that cover the same incidents.

Mr. Spencer overwhelmingly uses Ibn Ishaq's biography of the Prophet, which is well known to contain all the stories he had heard about the Prophet - the correct and the fabricated ones without discrimination as per Ibn Ishaq himself - who admitted that "only Allah knows which one is correct."

Throughout his book, the author subtly divides humanity into an east and west. And while any bit of logic dictates that there is no monopoly on human decency by any race, religion, or nation on earth, you will constantly get the notion that the east - represented by Islam and Muslims (in the eye of the author) - is guilty till never proven innocent, to the limit that sometimes he makes the east guilty of incidents that were historically, mainly committed in what he collectively calls "the west." So be aware and beware.

Throughout the book Mr. Spencer uses old techniques that are effective sometimes with simple minded and half ignorant people. One simply states a few, undeniable facts, then out of nowhere slips you an absurd assumption that has no relation to truth, logic or sometimes even the subject at hand, and then quickly moves to the next paragraph!

This is the street, this is a car, this is a building, and this is the flying, blue elephant!

You will read in Mr. Spencer's book some baffling terminologies. Two examples:

The first is, whenever the subject is about Islamic, Arab or Middle Eastern documented and authentic history, the author will never call it history, and rather he calls it "traditions"! And while the term "Christian tradition" is not one that Mr. Spencer had invented himself, yet manufacturing or reflecting what that term entails upon Islam is anything but being truthfully objective. Muslim scholars who founded the process of verifying testable evidence of the companions who lived the events by the minute and quoted Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)'s sayings and life with astounding accuracy, in the author's perspective, could never have been trusted with their own history! It has to be the account of somebody else who agrees with what the author wants it to be; otherwise it is all old tales that, over time became "traditions"!

Within the context of Islam, the word tradition is tricky when translated. A core fundamental belief in Islam is the belief in the Holy Quran and the tradition of the Prophet (PBUH) as a perfect human example of how we should live our lives. What the Prophet (PBUH) has ordered Muslims to do becomes an order as respected and followed as an order in the Holy Quran itself.

How the Prophet did things also becomes a preference and a reference to Muslims in the similar situation. The word "Sunnah" translated here to "tradition" is strictly the tradition of the Prophetic orders and behavior, and absolutely cannot be confused with the common meaning of an Egyptian, American or any historical or cultural tradition for that matter, yet that is the confusing technique the author uses almost every time he uses the word "traditions" with Islam.

The second example is certain categorizations of Muslims with expressions manufactured by some in the media that have no translation or even comparison in the Arabic language or in Islam! A glaring example is "**Jihadist,**" which is another made up flavor of what the

media used to call the "Mujahideen" in Afghanistan when they were supported by the CIA to freedom fight the Russian occupation in the 1980s. Jihadist should be the translation of an Arabic word pronounced "Jihady," only there is no such a word in either Arabic or Islam - this is a word you read over a hundred times in his book - Jihadist!

What is Jihad in Islam?

Jihad in Arabic means to strive: in Islam, that is striving for the sake of God. It has many forms. Jihad can be done with your money, knowledge, or power, and in the case of war with fighting in your nation's army for the sake of God, not Halliburton.

"To believe in Allah and his messenger, and to make Jihad for the sake of Allah with your monies and with your own selves" ***Holy Quran, Surat (Al Saff) Ch. (61) No (11)***

"الساعي على الأرملة والمسكين ، كالمجاهد في سبيل الله ، أو القائم الليل والصائم النهار"

"The sponsor of a widow or a needy person, is like the one making Jihad for the sake of God, or Praying at night, and fasting at day"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: *Abou Hurayra.* ***Reference:*** *Saheeh Al Buckhary,* ***Number:*** *5353.* ***Degree:*** *Correct.*

أن جاهمة جاء على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ، فقال : يا رسول الله ! أردت أن أغزو ، وقد جئت أستشيرك ؟ فقال : هل لك من أم . قال : نعم ، قال : فالزمها فإن الجنة تحت رجليها

When a young man (Jahema) wanted to join the Muslim army, the Prophet asked him if his mother was alive; when the young man said yes, the Prophet ordered him:

"Go and keep her company, for paradise is underneath her feet"
i.e. serving his mother supersedes joining the army.
Narrator: *Moawea Ibn Jahema Alsalmy.* ***Reference:*** *Al Albany of Saheeh Alnasaye,* ***Number:*** *3104.* ***Degree:*** *Correct/Good.*

Yet the only kind of Jihad Mr. Spencer dedicates himself to, is the military kind which in Islam is almost equivalent to military draft in America. When the Muslim nation is under attack or a population is oppressed, in danger, or prohibited from receiving the message of God when they don't have the freedom to decide for themselves, it becomes a religious obligation to all men able to fight to join the Army. What did I just say? Is there such a thing as an American man called "drafty," describing his ability to be drafted to the army? No. The same applies in Arabic and Islam.

Historical facts:

1- In all the battles that the Prophet fought, two offerings of peace were given ample time before battle, and when it was rejected, the Prophet and his army would fight man to man, even when they were severely outnumbered (which occurred most of the time). Ahead of anyone else, the Prophet was always in the front line of battle, sacrificing himself for the sake of God and the righteous cause of stopping oppression. Army to army, face to face, and in broad daylight:

"Then fight (Muhammad (PBUH)) in the Cause of Allah, none is tasked except for yourself, and incite the believers to fight along with you, so it may be that Allah will stop the evil might of the infidels. And Allah is Stronger in Might and Stronger in punishing"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nissa) Ch (4) No (84)

فَقَاتِلْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ لَا تُكَلَّفُ إِلَّا نَفْسَكَ ۚ وَحَرِّضِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ۖ عَسَى اللَّهُ أَنْ يَكُفَّ بَأْسَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ۚ وَاللَّهُ أَشَدُّ بَأْسًا وَأَشَدُّ تَنْكِيلًا (84

2- No call for Jihad or fighting was ever declared by any Muslim subgroup at the time of the Prophet or even under his approval. Jihad as per the Prophet of Islam and as per God doctrine in the Holy Quran is a call to the entire nation by the leader of the Muslim nation to a one army battle. **"And fight in the Way of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress the limits. Truly, Allah does not like the transgressors"**
Holy Quran Surat (Al Baqara) Ch (2), No (190)
(وَقَاتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ (190

Having said that, what is the best kind of Jihad in Islam?

"The best Jihad is a word of truth to a tyrannical ruler"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Abou Aumama. **Reference**: Saheeh Al jamee, **Number**: 4954. **Degree**: Correct.*

3- Did anyone or any Muslim group ever violate the rule of Jihad and used it as an excuse to commit violence? Of course some did. Why? Because, people will always break the rules and commit crimes; don't humans do that anywhere anyhow mostly for made up excuses? Is it a crime in Islam? Yes. Why? Please refer back to No 1, 2 and 3.

In the same example you will constantly see the notion that the author supports real fascism-propaganda doctrines like: "Watch out they live amongst us", pre-emptive strikes, and oppressing people for their ideology, identity, race, ethnicity, or worse, their intentions that the author and his peers claim advance knowledge of. At the same time, he accuses his best friends - the "Jihadist warriors" of his imagination - of potentially wanting to do the same when they take over the west!

So is it that a brand of fascism is better than the other, or is it that the author and the agenda that he represents are desperately trying to terrify us of a scarecrow that can only be seen in their own mirrors?

Finally, I apologize for being sarcastic at times, but that is what screaming misinformation does to you!

ACCORDING TO ISLAM:

Islam means to surrender all matters to the One and only Mighty God (Allah).

Islam is the religion of Abraham, David, Moses, Jesus and all the Prophets and messengers of the one mighty God.

You are not a Muslim if you don't believe in all of God's Prophets.

Muhammad (PBUH), who is a descendant of Ismail son of Abraham, is the last Prophet of God (Allah) who brought the completed religion and the Word of God unaltered, as the last Prophet of God to mankind and the world.

The Holy Quran is the book of God that contains the text and Word of God that was "truly" given - to the letter - to all Prophets of God since Adam, Abraham, and all the way to Muhammad (PBUH) (PBU all of them).

Holy Quran is the Prophethood miracle of Muhammad (PBUH).

In the Holy Quran the word Muhammad (PBUH) is mentioned 4 times.

The word Eissa (Jesus) (PBUH) is mentioned 25 times.

The word Moses (PBUH) is mentioned 131 times.

Pictures or illustrations of Muhammad (PBUH) and his first followers are forbidden; only following the message of God should be praised.

There are no holy men or high priests in Islam, only scholars respected for their knowledge of the book of God, tradition of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), and Islamic law. Such knowledge is available for any Muslim to gain.

There are no middlemen between Muslims and God.

Jesus is a Prophet of God created by a Word of God and from His spirit.

Virgin Mary is the greatest woman that ever lived and will ever live; Read Holy Quran Chapter (19) (Maryam).

The biggest sin of Islam is Atheism or associating a partner with God.

The Five Pillars of Islam are:

*To certify that there is no God but Allah, and that Muhammad (PBUH) is his worshipper and messenger.

*Praying to God five times a day.

*Paying charity (Zakah) to the poor, which is 2.5% annually of unspent assets.

*Fasting daily for the holy month of Ramadan.

*Pilgrimage to Mecca once in your life if you are physically and financially sound.

People were created to worship God, in everything they do.

Life is a test where following the Word of God and Islamic law provides dignifying, safe, prosperous life, while preparing for the eternal afterlife. On Judgment day, if one's virtuous deeds outweigh his sins, he enters Heaven, and if vice versa, he will enter Hell fire.

Before Judgment day, Jesus (PBUH) will descend from Heaven, Kill the Anti-Christ, and spread peace on earth till God inherits the earth and what is on it.

Notes from Moustafa Zayed:

*We will copy the titles of Mr. Spencer's paragraphs as is.

* According to Islamic manners, "Peace be upon him" or (PBUH) is a phrase of respect to be mentioned after the name of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and all Prophets.

*Allah is the name of the One Mighty God of Abraham, Moses and Jesus (PBU all of them) in the Old Testament and according to the current New Testament.

*MZ refers to a comment by Moustafa Zayed.

* We added the "Index of Allegations" at the end of the book, so if you are looking for the refutal of a specific allegation, you can have a quick reference to the page that addresses that specific allegation. There are about 154 of them!

*Mr. Spencer never debated a true Muslim scholar; I invite him to a fair public debate anywhere, any time, and about any topic of Islam.

*Finally, please borrow Mr. Spencer's book from the library and don't buy it, my hope is that none of us want to support fascism with book purchases.

Acknowledgment

The Seerah of Ibn Ishaq

Ibn Ishaq authored a biography of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) that included the life of the Prophet before the beginning of his Prophethood, some of the Ignorance era before declaring his Prophethood, then (after his immigration to Mecca), his life in Medina, his battles, and his sent missions till his death (PBUH).

Ibn Ishaq's method of event chorography and narration is not completely clear, as his writings didn't reach us except through quoting him in the books of the scholars who came after him. The closest of which is "Tahzeeb Al Seerah" of Abdel Mlik Ibn Hesham. Please note that there is no such thing as a complete biography of Ibn Ishaq to begin with, but only the excerpts of later scholars who quoted some of it.

Ibn Hesham, however, stated that he purified the narrations of Ibn Ishaq by writing:
"...And I left some of what Ibn Ishaq had narrated that is not of the quotations of the Seerah of the Prophet of Allah (PBUH), that which the Holy Quran never mentions, that is no reason of this book, an interpretation of, or a witness to it"

Also Ibn Hesham stated that he: "also left what Imam Bukaey - his teacher of the correct quotations of the Prophet and his Seerah- didn't certify as correct "

In the Seerah (Biography of the Prophet) of Ibn Hesham, he quotes Ibn Ishaq at times, and sometimes he quotes himself.

Ibn Ishaq's method was based on narrating the events the way they reached him, whether with proofs, weak proofs or no proofs at all. He, for example, relied upon unknown sources; in some instances he would say: "Some people with knowledge told me" or "Some people in

Mecca told me." About some of his narrations, he would describe his sources by "As they claimed" or "As they remembered".

In many of his narrations, when he didn't know whether the narration was true or a fabrication, he would say, "Only Allah is more knowledgeable about the truth of that." He also, when faced with several narrations of the same incident, would mix the related proofs - if any - all together without discrimination.

Ibn Ishaq was like a man who gathered every dollar he found: the real money and the counterfeit. Then later, others came with mechanisms that filtered his real dollars from the fake. Mr. Spencer ignores all the real dollars and looks almost exclusively inside Ibn Ishaq's bag and picks only the counterfeit ones!

"He was Caesar and Pope in one, but he was Pope without the Pope's pretentions, and Caesar without the Legions of Caesar: without a standing army, without a bodyguard, without a palace, without a fixed revenue; if ever any man had the right say that he ruled by the right Divine, it was Mohammad, for he had all the powers without its instruments and without its supports."

R. Bosworth Smith, "Mohammad and Mohammadanism", London 1874

Chapter One

"Why a biography of Muhammad is relevant today"

On page one, the author wrote:
"Islamic law, (which includes death penalty for Christian converts)..."

*First of all, Christians were an absolute minority in Arabia at the time of the Prophet (PBUH). All notions that Islam was there to appease Christians, attack them, or specifically target Christians whether positively or negatively, are just not true.
Tolerance is the overriding principal of Islamic law in dealing with non-Muslims, and again, Christians were an absolute minority in Arabia.

The author tries to constantly make it a Muslim VS. Christian case to imply falsely that anything Muslim is automatically and violently anti-Christian, which is not only wrong but the absolute opposite of the truth.

Historical facts:
1) The first scholar of any religion to identify Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) as a Prophet of God (Allah) was the Christian scholar Warqa Ibn Nawfal, who was a member of Khadija's family (the Prophet (PBUH)'s wife).

2) Under the author's own Chronology on page (XI) and on the year 615, he wrote:
"Friction with the Quraysh causes Muslims to leave Arabia for Abyssinia."

*The author fails to mention that of all places to flee to from the oppression of the pagans of Mecca; Muhammad (PBUH) ordered his followers to go there for it was ruled by, "**A righteous Christian king**."

3) In the tenth year of Hijra, the Prophet, as the most powerful man in the Arab Peninsula at the time, received the Christians of Najran in the Mosque. There, he allowed them to perform their prayers and pledged to give them the rights that Muslims had, and even promised to repair their old churches out of the Muslim treasury. The cost wouldn't even be considered a debt upon the Christians! This tolerance and civility in the seventh century is unheard of, even according to today's standards. Was it just an isolated incident, for it was the Prophet himself, or was this Islamic law in general?

"May Allah keep the rule of the Turks forever...they take the Jizyah tax and they never interfere with religions whether their people are Christians, Jews or Samarians, but the Cursed Polish are never content with the taxes and fees from their brethren in Christ, even though they serve them willingly, yet they put them under the authority of the unjust Jews, the enemies of Christ, who never allow them to build churches or leave them priests who know the secrets of their religion."
Makarius, the Patriarch of Antakya, (14th century).

This telling quote not only shows the inherent tolerance in Islam of all non-Muslims, but also indicates the level of prejudice against Jews at the time in non-Muslim lands.

4) For those who do not know that Islamic law never mandated killing Christian converts or even any other converts for their religion, race, gender or ethnic background, let us examine the following:

If being a Muslim means automatically that you are anti-Christian, how is it that Islam is the only non - Christian faith that believes in the immaculate birth of Jesus (PBUH) and Virgin Mary, glorifies and testifies for them (PBU both of them)?
How is it that the Muslims' Holy Quran is the only Holy Scripture in the world (that includes any Gospel you may have), that has an entire chapter named after Virgin Mary, glorifying and describing her as the greatest woman that ever lived and will ever live?
Read Holy Quran, Surat "Maryam" (Ch. 19), and "Al Omran" (Ch. 3)

How is it, according to Islamic law, that if you do not believe in all God's prophets, Jesus (PBUH), or in his original Gospel, you cannot be a Muslim?

On page four and after the author quoted two modern Muslim scholars about the merciful and forgiving nature of the Prophet (PBUH), he quoted one of them:
"Islamic traditions include a number of instances of the Prophet having the opportunity to strike back at those who attacked him, but refraining from doing so" - Ibrahim Hooper of CAIR

Yet the author then wrote:
"But the international riots and murders committed over these cartoons - universally explained by the perpetrators as revenge for the alleged insult on Muhammad - suggested that Hooper's view was by no means universally accepted by Muslims."

*Is it logical that isolated incidents can be considered a universally accepted tendency of the 1.6 billion (and growing) Muslims? Hundreds of thousands of drivers drive through red lights, endangering themselves and the public every year. Does that mean that Americans universally do not accept or adhere to traffic laws? And even if all Muslims are hypothetically outraged about a dirty attack against humanity's last Prophet of God, what is the relation between that and "the truth about Muhammad " himself?

On pages 4, 5 and 6, the author quotes individuals representing outlawed organizations that some characterize as terrorist and others as freedom fighter. Such organizations, regardless, have no scholarly status of any respectable weight in Islam, or Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh). You want to research the American constitution, then read it or quote it for us. You want to learn about who Thomas Jefferson really was, then read an authentic biography of his, or at least read what the man historically had done, said or authored. But then why would you go and quote someone who could possibly be a Charles Manson, to tell us who Jefferson "truly" was?

I can only perceive, if you do so, that demonizing or at least altering the truth about Jefferson is your ulterior motive.

On pages 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, the author makes several illogical and historically untruthful assumptions:

1-That Quranic texts, since they are in Arabic, are not understood by Muslims even if they were translated to their native language from Arabic, and asserts that it is similar to the difficulty of a King James Bible translation!

2- That there is a raging intellectual battle between peaceful Muslims and what he calls Jihadist terrorists about a somewhat mystical historical Muhammad who is yet to be clearly fully discovered, and that the outcome of such an imaginary battle will be determined by discovering who he really was!

***Historical facts:**

1- Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is not only the most quoted man in history, but also the most accurately quoted and biographed man in history. Is the author looking for where the sun has been historically shining every day, as well?
2- Except for a few letters in the beginning of some chapters in the Holy Quran, (their meaning has not been revealed yet) almost every verse in the Holy Quran is either understood or interpreted by the companions of the Prophet (PBUH) and later Muslim scholars.
3- Some of the verses that have multiple meanings are mainly the ones that describe pure scientific phenomena of God creations. For example, the verses about the phases of the human embryo were not fully understood till the invention of electronic microscopes; then, it became one of the most glaring scientific miracles of the Holy Quran, as per how accurately God had described a fetus's stages of growth 1400 years ago.
Read Holy Quran- Al Mouminoun (The believers) Ch. (23) No (12-14)

So if the author is trying to discover a mystical historical Muhammad (PBUH) 1400 years after his prophecy had begun, contradicting the

ocean of continuous certain knowledge about him, then he could only be looking for another Muhammad other than Muhammad (PBUH) the Prophet of Islam, or just attempting to alter the "truth" about the Prophet and the fundamentals of the religion of 1.6 billion Muslims all together.

On Page 13, the author states:
"Criticism of Muhammad or even Islam is not and should not be considered equivalent to anti- Semitism. Islam is not a race"

*First of all, technically an Anti- Semite is one who hates Arabs, for they are the largest Semite race on earth - pushing 400 million- vs. their genetic cousins, the other group of Semites, - between 15 to 17 millions- the Jews. As a matter of fact the number of Muslim men who carry the names of Jewish Prophets - in Islam they are Prophets of God, Islam, and are respected as Muhammad (PBUH) himself (PBU all of them) - are more than four times the entire Jewish population in the world! It is interesting to say that Semite as a term was originally for the language itself and not for people, i.e. an Anti-Semite should be someone who hates Hebrew as a language!
As we explained in the preface, while the author apparently is against anti- Semitism, he runs to affirm that attacking Islam or the Prophet of 1.6 billion Muslims cannot be compared to attacking Judaism or a highly revered figure of the Jews. So our champion of civil rights here indicates that religious profiling and discrimination is somewhat acceptable compared to racial discrimination, in the matter fact may be preferred in the eyes of Mr. Spencer if you just have the excuse of a tendency to hate Islam and Muslims.
So if you can create any excuse for your hate, is it acceptable?
What is the stark difference then, if there is any, between Mr. Spencer and his self-proclaimed "Jihadist" fascist terrorists?!

The author then asserts that the teachings of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) must be ones that persuade his followers to commit violence, because - he throws the names of his Jihad terrorists - these people or

organizations use the name and the teachings of Muhammad (PBUH) as their excuses for their actions.
So if the teachings of Muhammad (PBUH) are "truly" as such, why not show them to us, translate them correctly and within the correct historical context, so we can see for ourselves?
If Mr. Spencer is a hate mongering, oppressive fascist - hypothetically speaking - and he misuses the tenets of the American constitution of civil rights and freedom of speech to further his evil causes, would that be the fault of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, the constitution, or the entire American population?

On the same page 13, about the Danish cartoons controversy, the author wrote:
"The Danish cartoons controversy indicated the gulf between the Islamic world and the post-Christian west on matters of freedom of speech and expression"

*I believe what really alarmed the author is the unity in the outcry of the Muslim world against ridiculing the last Prophet of God (PBUH). The author definitely has the right to wonder why the Muslims reaction wasn't like that in the west when Jesus (PBUH) is depicted sometimes in the most offensive of ways. But he is absolutely wrong when he indirectly expects that Muslims should blindly adapt to the habits of others as a beacon of light or a reference and guidance as to how to evaluate right from wrong, especially when it comes to their Prophet of God.
If the author himself would slander or libel any one of 300 million Americans, he would be subjecting himself to be sued for hefty damages. But when you know that the ultimate symbol of righteousness and perfect manners for 1.6 billion people is Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and still go ahead and offend them all by offending him, and intentionally I might add, then why would you be surprised of the reaction? Personally I don't know which nation or group that can come to England for example and dictate to the English how to react as a nation to an unacceptable insult to the entire British population?

How would you then justify that you offend the Muslims, the Prophet of God, and then criticize the worldwide Islamic rejection to that insult while requesting that all Muslims should adhere to some other culture's behavioral model?
Had the cartoonists published similar offensive cartoons in any Muslim country attacking Jesus (PBUH), instead, they would have been prosecuted and jailed just the same as if it was an offense against Muhammad (PBUH) himself...
And while we are at the subject, you will never find one book, article or word about Jesus (PBUH) in any Muslim country, but of praise and reverence, for he is a mighty Prophet of God and of Islam. You will never find one similar book to Mr. Spencer's like the one we are refuting, attacking Jesus (PBUH) or any Prophet of God in any Muslim country.

What you will also never find is Mr. Spencer mentioning this glaring and absolutely relevant fact anywhere in his "truth" finding campaign of "Let the Christian west hate anything Muslim" crusade.
In the "real" decency of Islamic law, there are limits to some things, because not everything is unlimited. Structural pillars of societies are not to be tampered or joked with. You can live in the building of society, do whatever you want in your privacy, walk on your hands in the lobby to your apartment if you want, but when you are seen sledge hammering one of the pillars that support the entire building, then it is everyone's duty to stop you. Even from a pure secular stand point, the universally collective moral opinion of the Muslim world is that such cartoons were an outrage, what more freedom of speech or expression you could want from them if freedom of expression is really what you are for?
Marching in the streets, however, causing material damage to others who didn't draw any cartoons or personally offend the Prophet, and certainly the horrible crime of causing death to the innocent, are against all fundamental laws and manners of Islam. And while these incidents are not acceptable by Islam or the Prophet himself had he been alive at the time, humans of any race anywhere, at moments of anger, will always take things to extremes. The most Islamic reaction to the cartoons in my opinion was that some Muslims boycotted every company whose

products were advertised on any media that published the cartoons, which is what I call the civil freedom that all people should be aware of: the freedom of voting with your dollar.
Some Muslims used it most effectively.
Finally to whoever describes the dirty cartoons as a part of the civility of freedom of speech, I remind them with the fact that only animals leave their droppings and filth openly and anywhere.

"Death to blasphemy"

On page 14, the author mentions the murders of multiple individuals who by the author's own admission offended and intended insults to Islam and Muslims in Holland.
I am sure that the reader has guessed by now that a main theme of the author demonizing Muslims is drawing back on Islam and all Muslims any crime committed by the absolute few for whatever reason, with the excuse that the criminal is a Muslim or has a Muslim name.
It is really baffling. People everywhere with any ethnic, religious, economic background commit the most horrible of crimes every second and for the most stupid and bizarre of reasons sometimes, yet when the killer is a Muslim committing the crime of taking a soul without justice, which the author knows is punishable in Islamic law by death, the author would run and cry, "see, he is a Muslim." Yes, he is. And if it is a crime, then he is a Muslim criminal, like there is a Jewish criminal, a Hindu criminal, an Argentinean criminal and a hate-mongering criminal!
What fascinates me is the only group in the world that believes blindly in the laughable notion that "the criminals and killers always tell the truth", and constantly quote them is Muslim-haters!

Mr. Spencer will not stop day or night quoting the committers of the most horrible of crimes, impose their insanity sometimes as a unique ideology, then paint the entire religion of Islam and its billion and a half followers with the same brush! Should I count how many serial killers all over the world killed thousands of innocent souls for no reason whatsoever, and then claimed that God ordered them to do so? Did you

hear Muslims call them Christian, Jew or atheist fascists, or even call it a crime of religion?

"Defending freedom of speech"

Reading page 15 and 16, it was hard to contain myself from grinning when the author wrote:
"...And it is not my intention to insult Muhammad, to deride him, to lampoon or mock him, or to write anything except a scrupulously accurate account of what he said and did about some key issues."

*Such a quest has also been a personal endeavor all my life, the only difficulty I faced personally is the shear greatness of the amount of material about the life of the great Prophet of God (PBUH) for as we mentioned earlier, he is not only the most quoted man in history but also the most accurately quoted and biographed.
So if this is the same task the author takes, then one of us is in for a major surprise, for one of us is seriously wrong, and my contention is that he already knows it!

"General notes"

On page 16, the author makes the most bizarre statement I heard in a long time (and I have heard a lot). He wrote:
"Holy Quranic verse numeration is not standard"**!!!**

*What?! For 1400 years not one verse number of any verse of the Holy Quran has ever changed from the exact way that it was revealed to Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) by arch-Angel Gabriel before his passing, and the author is now quoting us from a Holy Quran translation that has "different numbers"?
"Excuse me for I will intentionally confuse you and alter the truth going forward", is all I understood from what the author wrote.

"The eastern churches in Asia were already separated from the rest of the Christian world which was not to support them in any way considering them heretics of the religion. Therefore the sheer existence of theses churches today is in itself a strong evidence of the general tolerance of Islamic governments towards them"

Sir Thomas walker Arnold, the most prominent orientalist in history

Chapter Two

On page 20, the author wrote:
"The Holy Quran is, according to Islamic tradition, a perfect copy of an eternal book- the umm al-kitab or mother of the book – that has existed forever with Allah"

*Before we answer I want to remind the reader again that there is no such a thing as "Islamic tradition" there is the "Prophet's tradition". The author's statement is not true, for "Umm al-kitab" was never the name of the Holy Quran but a name of the first chapter of the Holy Quran known by "Al-Fatiha" or "The Opening." The name the author needed to know for the eternal copy of the Holy Quran is "Al-Lauh اش Mahfooz" which means "The protected tablet."

Later on page 20, the author indicates that in chapter 48: verse 27 (Al-Fateh) he has made a discovery! Which is:
"(while it is an undeniable fact of Islam that every word in the Holy Quran is a Word of God to all Muslims): how is it that God then says "In Shaa Allah" which means God willing?"

*The answer is that it is obvious that Mr. Spencer either didn't read the entire Holy Quran, or believes his readers never did, because what he thinks is a discovery is all over the Holy Quran in many ways, where God speaks about himself as, "Allah", "your God", and "he is the most merciful," "powerful," "able," "all-knower", and more. It is a feature of God's revelation of referring to himself as an infinite entity, in plural for praise in many cases, and repeated throughout the Holy Quran often, even in a form like "he who created for you…"
I urge Mr. Spencer to read more than just one verse or chapter of the Holy Quran, or at least assume that we do!

On pages 20 to 24, the author criticizes the narrative of the Holy Quran that it is not self explaining of some of the verses, and criticizes having to depend on the historical tradition of the quotations of the Prophet (PBUH) and historical statements of his companions.

*If the Holy Quran was the current Bible, for example where most of its chapters were written sometimes a hundred years after the incidents covered, and in the form of stories about Jesus (PBUH) and Biblical Prophets, then some verses of the Holy Quran may need some self explanation to fit into such format. But the Holy Quran was memorized verbatim as it was revealed by Arch-Angel Gabriel to the Prophet (PBUH), then kept to date the same exact way.

For example when someone today says, "The damage that Katrina caused was devastating," we would all, today, know exactly what he is talking about. The most important thing for humanity - 1400 years from now - is that what that person had said should stay exactly the same to the letter if that speaker was God himself. People then, however, would just go to authentic historical sources to learn the historical context of what happened when Katrina hit. The Word of God that is the Holy Quran, was never altered, changed, and still is in its original language, but most importantly, this is how God said it and how he forever wants it kept and given to mankind. At the same time, there is no disconnection between the historical contexts of the verses, the occasions of revealing them, and an ocean of authentic historical context about them.

Then, the author takes an example with Surat (Al-Tahreem) Ch. (66) which covers an incident between the Prophet and his wives.

*Here is what really happened. The Prophet (PBUH) was the kindest to his wives, and it was he (PBUH) who said:
"**Your best are your best to their women**" i.e. their mothers, wives, daughters and sisters.
*Narrator: Abu Hurayra. **Reference:** Al Tarmazy, **Number:** 1162. **Degree:** Correct/Good.*

The Prophet's wife Hafsa once got jealous that he brought another wife into her house in a day that he specified earlier for her. In caring for Hafsa's feelings, the Prophet swore not to come near the other wife (Mariyah the Copt) and in caring for the effect of that oath on Mariyah, the Prophet (PBUH) asked Hafsa not to tell anyone about his oath, but she went ahead and told his wife (Ayesha). Before we get into the verses of the Holy Quran revealed for this specific incident, we need to know that Allah made it so that the Prophet in certain situations be corrected and advised about certain matters, to give us a practical human example of matters we need to pay attention to, be affirmed about, or be made specifically clear to mankind. One of these instances is when Allah revealed to Muhammad (PBUH) that to care for the feelings of one wife cannot be at the expense of the "Halal" or the lawful right that Allah had given another wife upon the Prophet (PBUH). Allah revealed to the Prophet that Hafsa didn't keep her promise to the Prophet and told Ayesha. In addition, Allah showed in the following verse to the Prophet and all of us that when you take an oath- breaking an oath is a major sin in Islam-, then later you discover that that oath would entail disobeying God or oppressing someone's right, then for the sake of Allah you can break that oath, but pay for feeding 10 needy persons as expiation.
The following Verse promised the wives of the Prophet that if they make more materialistic demands on the Prophet and burden him, that Allah can exchange them for better wives in everything.
Here is what Mr. Spencer wrote about the incident:
"In this scenario the revelation of Sura 66 concerns only his wives jealousy (or perhaps Muhammad's bad breath) and his oath to stop drinking honey"

I have no further comment!

"Hadith"

On page 24, the author defines Hadith - pronounced correctly as "Hadeeth" - as "traditions of the Prophet" (PBUH), which is not true. Hadeeth is the collected sayings or quotations of the Prophet (PBUH) and the narrations of events that show his behavior. The tradition of the

Prophet (PBUH) is "Sunnah" or the behavioral example of his biography of which the majority of Muslims are described as (Sunni) or followers of the traditions of the Prophet (PBUH).

On page 25, the author quotes the Muslim scholar Ahmed Von Denffer - a German Muslim – that:
"there is an agreement between Muslim scholars that the contents of Sunnah are also from Allah".

*Which also is not true. Parts of the Sunnah are from Allah, especially the worshipping details and the correct quotations of the Prophet (PBUH). In the Holy Quran, Allah says:

"..And whatever the Messenger gives you, take it, and whatever he forbids you, abstain from it.."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Hasher) Ch. (59) No (7)

وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا ۚ... (7)

So Islamic law is derived from both sources, only when it comes to the Sunnah, it is only the sections where the Prophet ordered or asked us to do or not to do things, either verbally, by gesture or even by just not opposing an issue. For that matter if the Hadeeth is correct and authenticated, then Allah tells us in the Holy Quran:

"**And he doesn't utter of self desire**"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Najm) Ch. (53) No (3)

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ (3)

Having said that, there are many parts of the Seerah (Biography of the Prophet) and the tradition of the Prophet that are not parts of the Sunnah of the (Halal and Haram) or what is allowed and what is forbidden; an example is the personal preferences of the Prophet (PBUH) in certain foods, clothes, travelling routes to take vs. others, etc. which the Prophet (PBUH) himself did, but never ordered Muslims to do or not to do.

The author then continues to an absurd fabrication, when he claims in the next paragraph that in the huge amount of information about the Prophet (PBUH), there is no way to know what is correct and what is not!!

*Really!!

Imam Al Bukhary, the author of the legendary reference "Saheeh al Bukhary" of the correct Hadeeth (quotations of the Prophet), had memorized over 300,000 Hadeeths of the Prophet with the chain of who said the Hadeeth last till who heard it from the Prophet himself first.

He identified 60,000 correct Hadeeth that he certified were correct, then used the most ingenious and rigorous way of authenticating a historical quote by researching and memorizing the detailed biographies of 2500 companions and followers of the Prophet. He even travelled to their towns, so when someone says that a person heard the quotation from another, he would filter it to their credibility, the possibility of the two individuals meeting each other in person, and chronically, all the way to how many other credible sources confirming the same text to the letter.

The same rigorous authentication - testable evidence - founded for the first time in history by Imam al Buckhary, was pursued by the great six Hadeeth scholars, Ahmed, Muslim, al Turmezy, Ibn Majah, al Nasaey, and Ibn Daoud, covering hundreds of thousands of Hadeeths and narrations of the Prophet's biography. The science of Hadeeth actually had come to the level that almost every Hadeeth of hundreds of thousands of Hadeeths are already rated by their levels of authenticity. The ratings are: 1) Correct, 2) Good, 3) Weak (may be correct but we have weak verification of it) and, 4) Fabricated, probably by the "truth-seekers" of its time!

Now - with all that accurate account of every word, event, even gesture of the Prophet comes our truth-seeker Mr. Spencer, 1400 years later to tell us that it is impossible to tell what is authentic and what is not!

The author comments later about the six Hadeeth references that they are not authentic but that the "Muslims generally regard as trustworthy" as if the Muslims have no documented history, but strictly what they consider trustworthy tales of folklore!

On page 28, the author claims that:
"Many incidents in the Prophet's life, including ones that became influential in Islamic history, have no other sources"

*What are these mystic incidents that were never heard by the hundreds of companions who narrated hundreds of thousands of the quotations and biography of the Prophet (PBUH) as eye witnesses? More importantly what many incidents that are so influential in Islamic history about the Prophet (PBUH) himself, that he never wanted to mention to any of his companions? Are they many and so influential that the Prophet (PBUH) or his companions never cared to mention to any source? How is it that Mr. Spencer is the one who received the unique knowledge of these "hidden incidents from the others for 1400 years"? Is this even logical to a five year old, in seeking the "truth" about Muhammad (PBUH)?

On page 30, after the author had quickly mentioned earlier the actually most used book of Seerah (Biography) of the Prophet (PBUH) which is Seeraht Ibn Hisham, he goes back and forth about how the stories of Seerat Ibn Ishaq were criticized by early Muslim scholars, and then desperately names people like a current Pakistani army general, to validate Seerat Ibn Ishaq for us!

The author then decides to rely first on the spotty Ibn Ishaq account, then relies last upon the most trusted sources of the Seerah and tradition of the Prophet (PBUH) which are the two Hadeeth books of Al Bukhary and Muslim, but also instead decides to rely upon Martin Ling's biography of the Prophet (PBUH) which is in many ways a good translation. But as true Muslim scholars know, it has also many grave errors about other incident, or maybe that is why Mr. Spencer has chosen it?

"Historical fact and Muslim belief"

On page 30, the author, on his own, jumps without any reasoning or historical fact to the little irrelevant conclusion that:
"Historical certainty is not easy to ascertain with a text as sketchy as the Holy Quran, as overwhelmed with false information as the Hadeeth"!!

* Holy Quran is the only Word of God that is still in its original language, not altered and not changed for over 1400 years with one copy in the hands of 1.6 billion people. The memorization of the correct Hadeeth of the Prophet was never interrupted for one day nor skipped generations like other scriptures, and to date, is all categorized into an accurate account of what is fabricated, what is accepted, what is good, and what is absolutely authentic. Yet the author can see nothing but sketchiness and false information!

In the matter of fact, I challenge Mr. Spencer to find me one man in history that is accurately quoted and biographed word for word in over 40 volumes just between the two references of Al Bukhary and Muslim alone. They are absolutely authentic, even by the admission of the author himself. The real truth is that the man Mr. Spencer claims of portraying the truth about, is already the most quoted and accurately biographed in history: The truth about Prophet Muhammad's every aspect of his life is a glaring sun and second to none.

On page 31, the author claims that there are some indications in Islamic History that the Holy Quran was altered!

* Remember the author claims that the "alterations" are many, and if that is true, in such a crucially important topic, it might crumple the foundation of Islam, yet he comes up with one laughable account with a comment of some early Muslim scholar that the Holy Quran - which contains many amazingly accurate predictions of future scientific discoveries - had a verse that spoke of the statement of Muslim Martyrs who were satisfied by their reward in paradise as God was pleased with

their righteous deeds! Posing the question that Judgment day didn't happen yet, so how can such a statement be true?

Again, Mr. Spencer does nothing but tell us either that he never read the Holy Quran, or he is just hoping that he writes for people who never read it just the same!
The Holy Quran even has dialogues between Believers and infidels on Judgment day about the joy and disappointment between the two parties; accurate description of Paradise and hell fire in the day that never happened yet. Do I need to remind that Allah, who has no limitations of time, distance or anything against His will, is the One whose word is the Holy Quran's? So when he describes to us what will happen in the future of his rewards to the righteous, through the words of his satisfied believers in paradise, in the author's words, that will be an indication that his word is altered? In the Holy Quran:
"The event (Judgment day) of Allah had already happened, so don't hasten it"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nahl) Ch. (16) No (1)

أَتَىٰ أَمْرُ اللَّهِ فَلَا تَسْتَعْجِلُوهُ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ (1)

If you look at the verse, the question begs that how has it already happened and how is it that Allah is asking us not to hasten it? The answer is that the future of anything already had happened in the realm of the knowledge of Allah. It was already written in the "Al Kitab Al Mubeen" before even creation started billions of years ago.

Does Mr. Spencer think that God doesn't know what will happen in the future? And you call that supposition "historical"?!

The author later names some anti-Islam orientalists, and then states that their opinions differ sharply from "the received wisdom" of Muslim scholars of Hadeeth.

*Are Muslim scholars, who are most knowledgeable about their history and strict rules of its subject religion, wrong, because some known non-Muslim haters of Islam and their theories are sharply

different than theirs?
Watch how the author describes absolute Islamic knowledge by "received wisdom" as if it is some mystical inherited cultural tales or rituals that people may utter or practice and receive from older generations as is without questioning. So if the scholars who are unparalleled historically for their genius and integrity are Muslims, then it is a fallible "received wisdom" and if the fabricators are Islam-hating orientalists, then they are trustworthy historians? And if there is a sharp difference of opinions, then it is the Muslim scholars who are doubted! Welcome to the roller coaster ride of Spencer land!

On pages 31 and 32; if you thought that the author started to totally lose it before, you thought wrong! In the last pages the author goes to the assumption; are you ready? That Muhammad (PBUH) may not have even existed!!

And the reason is that some people - unnamed as usual - thought, supposed, and may have scratched their heads in wonder about the fact?!!
In his head scratching, star gazing pretend, Mr. Spencer innocently wonders if that "mythical" figure Muhammad (PBUH) was conjured up! Why then did the Muslims keep some embarrassing stories – according to what the author's whole book is about - and not just omit them if the whole account is made up?
The answer that begs to jump out of his own question is: because these stories are twists of a real event that Muslims carried, and memorized, uninterrupted, of the life of the Prophet for 1400 years, without "Spencering!"

It is worth mentioning here that not only that the knowledge of the Seerah and quotations of the Prophet are second to none in the history of mankind in their accuracy and abundance, but it is also an uninterrupted - not for one half a day - knowledge throughout history, where no one man or even one group had a monopoly on such knowledge that was available at all times for students of the religion to

learn. Just an evidence of the mercy of God upon us, for there are no more Prophets to guide mankind after Prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

"I have studied him, the wonderful man, and in my opinion far from being an Anti-Christ, he must be called the Savior of Humanity."

Sir George Bernard Shaw, in "The Genuine Islam," Vol. 1.

Chapter Three

On page 34, the author wrote:
"One of these Gods, "Allah," not yet identified with the lone God of Islam, may have been the tribal God of the Quraysh"

*In the Holy Quran Allah reveals what the idolaters of Mecca have said about the Idols they were worshipping:
"**And we didn't worship them for anything but that they would get us closer to Allah**".
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Zomar) Ch (39) verse (3)

ۚ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مِن دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَىٰ ۖ (3)

So the Arabs before Islam knew Allah, only like many nations in the region before them, they modified the straight path to their Creator to yield to their desires or to the benefit of their powerful elite. In our case they used the excuse of trying to get closer to the one mighty God Allah by worshipping idols, which is what destroys the monotheistic core of worshipping God to begin with.
One of the glaring truths about all the Biblical Prophets is that they all worshipped the One Mighty Allah. The average western reader would automatically say I never heard of that name, and he is mostly correct, only because, some don't have a vested interest in telling him the fact.

If we read throughout the Old Testament - not the Holy Quran - and ask the Torah scholars what was the name of God in the Old scriptures, they will tell you it is pronounced "Allah-aim".

"Aim" here is plural for praise; note that it is also the last part of the Father of Prophets name "Ibrah-aim" - Abraham - (PBUH) as pronounced in Hebrew. So what is the name of God in the Old Testament? Allah.

Please notice the author's remark of "Lone God of Islam" as if Allah of Islam has nothing to do with Allah of the Bible.

In the New Testament Jesus (PBUH) on the cross cries (In Aramaic) **""Elohi, Elohi, lama sabachthani?" or** "My God, My God why have you forsaken me?"
Mark 15:34, Weymouth New Testament

Even though according to the Word of God in the Quran, Jesus (PBUH) was never killed nor crucified but was raised directly to heaven, the text shows clearly the word Allah as the name of God (when called to, it is pronounced "Elahi")

In addition to the fact of the majority of Prophets and messengers of God passed through the Arab Peninsula, Egypt and Palestine, the author, with the whiff of a pen, decided on his own that the Arabs never heard of the name of God identified by all the Old Testament Prophets, which is Allah or "Allah-aim" and when the pagans of Quraysh said that we worship these idols to get us closer to "Allah", the author decides for them, the Prophets, and us, that Allah is not Allah!

To be fair here, this is an old biased orientalists' trick, so when the Muslims explain that the fundamental of their religion is that it is the same true religion of the Biblical Prophets and that it is about worshipping the same One Mighty God Allah; God of Abraham (PBUH), the answer would say, that "Allah" is not 'Allah-aim" and that it is a new name of another God that belongs only to the Arabs!

On page 34, the author explains that Quraysh had a major influence on the tribes of Arabia so when they rejected Muhammad (PBUH)'s religion all tribes did the same, and when Quraysh accepted Islam they all followed"

*Another untruthful statement:
If that's the case, then which other tribe had another major influence upon Quraysh itself to influence it to accept Islam? What evidence at all that may support that statement? The Muslim army was powerful enough

that Quraysh surrendered without even attempting to raise one sword, so what other tribe that could have had a bigger army and influence than the Muslims had?
One of the major astounding achievements of the Prophet of God (PBUH) was his ability to bring people to worship their creator and fear him in dealing justly with their brothers in humanity.
A glaring example is the case of the two major tribes of Aous and Khazraj in Medina, who were ever battling each other to the most unthinkable of extents - in the next paragraph the author adds "Blood feuds were frequent"- but when the Prophet (PBUH) guided them to Islam, they not only stopped fighting each other, but united and became one tribe of one family of Islam, a story that was repeated all over the world. The author implies here that the entire Arab Peninsula's conversion to Islam was just a matter up to Quraysh's rejection or approval of the message of Islam, and not because of the Prophet's (PBUH) message or because of the tenets of Islam itself.

On page 36, the author brings a translation of the verse in Surat (Al Saff) - where Jesus (PBUH) says (his translation):
"I am the Messenger of Allah (sent) to you, confirming the law (which came) before me, and giving glad tidings of a messenger to come after me whose name shall be Ahmad"
Holy Quran Surat (Al Saff) Ch (61) verse (6)

*The translation is flawed and I might add intentionally so, for how is it that the translator would omit the sentence Jesus (PBUH) had actually said in the Holy Quran in the very same verse "**confirming what is between my hands of the Torah**"?

Here is the correct translation :
"**And Jesus, son of Maryam said: "O Children of Israel, I am the Messenger of Allah to you, confirming what is in between my hand of the Torah, and giving glad tidings of a Messenger to come after me, whose name shall be Ahmed.**

But when he (Muhammad (PBUH)) came to them with clear proofs, they said: "This is plain magic"
Holy Quran Surat (Al Saff) Ch (61) verse (6)

وَإِذْ قَالَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ يَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيَّ مِنَ التَّوْرَاةِ وَمُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِي مِنْ بَعْدِي اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدُ ۖ فَلَمَّا جَاءَهُمْ بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ قَالُوا هَٰذَا سِحْرٌ مُبِينٌ (6)

Some would say that Mr. Spencer doesn't speak Arabic and it is the translator's fault; I would then ask, how is it that these horrible translators keep almost exclusively appearing in Mr. Spencer's books? Does he know only them for some reason?
Or is it because in our case here, it is in today's Bible that Jesus (PBUH) said :
"I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"
King James Bible, Mathew 15:24
Is it that the author doesn't like the same truth to resonate between parts of the Bible and the Holy Quran?

On page 37, the author writes about two separate incidents. The first is a warning from the Christian monk Buhaira to Muhammad (PBUH)'s Uncle Abu Talib, to protect him from the Jews and not tell them about his nephew, because they will do him harm. The second is a story about a Jew who has seen the seal of Prophethood between Muhammad (PBUH)'s shoulders - when he was a child - and cried that the last Prophet is not a Jew and the new Holy Scripture will be taken from the Israelites. (The seal of Prophethood is a dark mark the size of a piece of grapes between the shoulders of the Prophet (PBUH)). Then oddly enough, the author adds that the Jew stated that Muhammad (PBUH) would fight the Jews and kill their scholars! Then the author adds from his history manufacturing facility that the Jewish man's statement is:

"A rather a revealing statement as an early Muslim view of the Mission of Muhammad (PBUH)"!

*Was Buhaira a Jew-hater, or wrong for warning Abu Talib against the Jews knowing about Muhammad (PBUH) as the new Prophet of God?
Let's inspect that; what happened to the last Prophet before Muhammad (PBUH)?

A faction of the Jews believed in him and another faction rejected him. Then what happened later? Was he killed by Muslims? No, some of the Jews who rejected him - and Jesus (PBUH) was a Jew himself - conspired to kill him, and according to the overwhelming narrative of the Christianity of today, he was killed by these Jews! According to the Holy Quran he (PBUH) was raised to heaven and was never killed - So what do you think some other similar faction of the Jews, might do to an Arab, not even a Jew, who comes with the same message from God? Send him flowers and chocolates?!

In the second incident the author summarizes the Mission of Muhammad (PBUH) by a statement of a Jewish man who cried hearing about the coming of Muhammad (PBUH) because he was an Arab not a Jew, so now, should the Mission of Islam or any other religion be identified by a statement of a crying fanatic of another religion?!

On pages 37 and 38, the author makes the old false claim that a Muslim or Islam is automatically anti-Jewish. And while the same claim was made for centuries against some writings in the Bible itself, truth -seekers like Mr. Spencer won't mention most of the time the obvious same fact in Biblical writings and in the Holy Quran.
The fact is that all Jewish Prophets were only sent to the Jewish people.

What does that mean? The meaning is that the believers of these Prophets were Jews who worshipped God and Jews who obeyed His messengers, but guess what else? The enemies of these Prophets, who fought them, killed them and angered God, were naturally also Jews.

So I ask any of the truth-seekers to put themselves in the position of the scriptures and tell us how to describe or criticize the later kind of Jews? Are they of a different species, Chinese, Aliens from outer space, or are still also Jews? It is simply like going to a maximum security prison in France and when asked about the nationality of all the criminals inside, you answer: they are all French. Someone would come after and state that you must be a French hater, as if the subject matter or the context in which the statement was made, which is the thing that matter the most in any objective evaluation of a statement, should never be considered or even mentioned.

In the Holy Quran God Says:
"And whoever wishes to believe should believe, and whoever wishes to be an infidel should be an infidel"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Kahf) Ch (18) verse (29)

فَمَن شَاءَ فَلْيُؤْمِن وَمَن شَاءَ فَلْيَكْفُرْ (29)

"So remind; you are not but a reminder"(21)
You are not to control them"(22)
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Ghashya) Ch (88) verses (21-22)

فَذَكِّرْ إِنَّمَا أَنتَ مُذَكِّرٌ (21)

لَّسْتَ عَلَيْهِم بِمُصَيْطِرٍ (22)

The most fundamental aspect of inviting people to Islam is to inform them of the truth that their Creator had revealed for them, in the politest and most lenient way. What they decide afterwards is their own decision, at least for it is their own responsibility and it would be only them who would answer for it to God on Judgment day, not me, you, or even the Prophets themselves.

On page 38, the author writes:
"It should be a matter of history that there is no record of Christians expecting a Prophet in Arabia 540 years after the death of Jesus"

*What about the Arab own records for the incidents at the time? And what about that Christianity and its Gospels were born and written in the Middle East? The author, as we explained in the previous chapters, considers history, credibility and objectivity only to be attributed to people who agree with his own ideology, so if I hate or oppose the ideology of a certain math teacher then 1+1 cannot be accepted to equal 2 anymore, because it is stated by the teacher I don't like! This is a known ideological disease called "generic fallacy."
What he is so strongly implying here - not to my surprise any more - is that the events that the historians of the Middle East and Arabia declared and carried through the centuries which they experienced firsthand, and which were never opposed at the time by even the biggest haters of Islam, our truth-seeker will never consider them a matter of history!
The author then goes to the end of the paragraph stating that the Pope at the time of the Prophet (PBUH) - as if the Pope had control or telepathic knowledge of factual events in Arabia at the time - didn't mention any thing that was expected to happen in Arabia! And since the Arabs - according to Mr. Spencer- are deaf, mute, and not aware of what happens in their societies and history, they had no history of Christianity and if they did, only the Pope might have known about it!
The author lastly, states that Christianity at the birth of the Prophet "was well established and seeking neither new Prophets nor new heresies."

*Just the notion that the sending of a Prophet or a message of God is validated only by what the "old establishment" leaders sought or accepted is just laughable.
I would also like to say specifically to the last quote, that maybe what happened all over Europe later, of saint worshipping, selling Indulgences (forgiveness documents), splitting into warring factions, inquisitions and burning women on the stake by the millions, must have then been done by the Muslims, because the Roman church was innocently busy being well established and innocently not expecting "new Prophets nor new heresies"!

As far as the claim that Christianity was not awaiting the coming of a new Prophet, I would say why ask the clairvoyant pope at the time?

I would instead go and ask Jesus (PBUH) about what Christianity was awaiting at the time. In **King James Bible**:

"And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, read this, I pray thee: and he says, I am not learned"
Isaiah 29:12

"And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever" (the last Prophet)
John 14:16

"Howbeit, when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth. For He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you things to come"
John 16:13

I might add that the current translation of "the spirit of truth" is totally erroneous, for in the original Greek text, you will find that the corresponding word to the "spirit of truth", the Greek word " Paraclete" which actually has nothing to do with the word "spirit" or even the word "truth", it means literally "**the praised one**" and if our truth-seeker never have mentioned the meaning of the Arabic word "**Muhammad**" to you yet, let me give you its literal translation; It is "**the praised one**".

"Khadija"

On page 38, the author says "Muhammad's boyhood was relatively uneventful"

* Till Muhammad (PBUH) had reached 40 years of age and received the first revelation from God, if you walked in Mecca and ask where is the " truthful honest" any one in the entire town would point to Muhammad (PBUH). Even before he knew himself to become a Prophet,

he was never seen fornicating, drinking, or doing any act of bad manners to even be mentioned later by his worst enemies. If that what the author means by "uneventful," then we thank him for the due praise.
The author then claims two major fabrications.
The first; that "without Khadija Muhammad might never have become a Prophet"!

*Another flying blue elephant example! How could it be possible that the author would fabricate something like that and not even care to comment on which magic he used to conjure it with? Was Khadija another Prophet who granted Muhammad (PBUH) his Prophethood? Was she a super genius comparative religions professor who dedicated her Harvard career to cooking him up a religion? Did he receive God's revelation through her? I am just trying to pull my eyebrows back down at the moment.

The second claim; is that Warqa Ibn Nawfal had known about Muhammad (PBUH)'s Prophecy for 15 years before the first revelation to the Prophet, which is not true.
The authenticated correct history tells us that Muhammad (PBUH) was so shocked and trembling of fear seeing the greatness of Arch Angel Gabriel (PBUH) for the first time, so Khadija went to Warqa and told him about what happened, and he immediately identified Muhammad (PBUH) as the awaited Prophet of God.

On page 40, the author shows several descriptions of the Prophet, but then shows the incident when the Prophet (PBUH) advised his companions of dying their beards with Al Henna (a hair dye and treatment), then the author tells us the shocking truth that:
"Al Mujahideen" dye their beards the same way like the Prophet !
Guilty your honor!! It is all in the dye!! So if I wear a suit and a beard like you, Mr. Spencer, would that turn me into a truth-seeker?

On pages 40 and 41, the author tells the story narrated by Ayesha about that what he (PBUH) seen were "dreams" and a truth descended

upon him when the Holy Quran was revealed to him for the first time! The story is absolutely true and absolutely not! It is true and narrated as such in the ultimate reference of Saheeh Al Bukhary, only as how the process of Muhammad (PBUH) seeking his creator started. In the beginning he would see visions in his sleep that later happened exactly the same way, after which he would tend to stay in open areas alone, then he chose to meditate in the cave of Hiraa alone. What is wrong is that the author narrated the story as if the actual revelations of the Holy Quran to the Prophet were in the form of visions in dreams!
Muhammad (PBUH) and for years, used to go to the cave of Hiraa to meditate in seclusion, and was not worshipping or praying to Allah at the time.
One night in the holy month of Ramadan, Gabriel (PBUH) appeared to him and asked him to read, he answered "I am not learned," the angel asked him to read again and for three times Muhammad (PBUH) would repeat the same answer: then, the first Sura revealed in the Holy Quran was recited to the Prophet by Archangel Gabriel:

"Read, In the Name of your Lord Who has created all that exists [1] He has created man from a leech like clot [2]"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Alaq) Ch (96) verses (1-2)

(1) اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ

(2) خَلَقَ الْإِنسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ

In itself the verse is a scientific miracle of the Holy Quran of accurately describing the fetus in its Microscopic early stages 1400 years before a microscope is invented!
Why then, would the author confuse his reader about the sequence of events of one of the most major events in the history of Islam?

Jesus (PBUH) will tell you why, when he (PBUH) said:
"And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, read this, I pray thee: and he says, I am not learned"
King James Bible, Isaiah 29:12

Maybe to confuse you and never allow you to draw a connection if you read that part of the Bible about the fundamental fact of how the first revelation of the Holy Quran was made to Muhammad (PBUH), the evidence of the coming of Muhammad (PBUH), and how the word of God will be revealed to him in today's Bible, is hid from the American reader.

The author later brings the authentic event of Gabriel (PBUH) descending and revealing himself to the Prophet (PBUH) and describing the true story as:
"This is the famous first revelation of the Holy Quran"

On page 43, the author tells the true story of the meeting between the Prophet and Warqa Ibn Nawfal after the first revelation, contradicting the fabricated story he brought just 5 pages ago on Page 38; that Warqa learned about Muhammad (PBUH) Prophethood from Maysara 15 years earlier!

On Page 44, the author brings a story of a test Khadija had done to see if Arch Angel Gabriel is truly an Angel! When the Prophet (PBUH) had told Khadija that he was to be the Prophet of God, her answer was that she absolutely believes that he was a Prophet of God:
"By Allah, Allah will never let you down, for you treat your family well, carry the weak, give to the have not, help with the hardship of righteousness, care for the weak and the needy, honor your guests, and you are the truthful honest"
*Narrator: Ayesha. **Reference**: Saheeh Al Buckhary, **Number**: 3. **Degree**: Correct.*

But when you go back to the author, why would Khadija test any angel's existence?

Now comes the appalling statement of the author:
" Muslim hardliners to this day insist upon the veiling of women because of, among other things, this underlying assumption: the sight of an unveiled woman is so distressing, so deeply sinful, that it causes even the angels to flee"!!!

Where is it in the Holy Quran or the Hadeeth of the Prophet, even the weak ones, that there is any mention that the creation of Allah of the women who are our mothers, daughters, sisters and wives is so distressing or sinful that Angels flee from it? Even if there was such an ignorant hard liner - of the religion of Islam itself - who might have made such a statement that is irrelevant to the fact that:
Islam is the religion of which, for the first time in history relieved women of the abhorrent original sin concept, and gave women their God given rights some of which they are deprived from even till today in some countries. In the Holy Quran:

"**Then Satan made them** (both) **slip from Paradise, and got them out from where they were**"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch (2) verse (36)

(36) فَأَزَلَّهُمَا الشَّيْطَانُ عَنْهَا فَأَخْرَجَهُمَا مِمَّا كَانَا فِيهِ ۖ

So Allah, in the Holy Quran, states that both Adam and Eve were deceived by Satan out of Paradise.

I can quote you Christian, Jewish or whatever men who claim that they talk to God Himself on a daily basis or just had coffee with angels; can anyone in his right mind evaluate any aspect of Christianity whether major or minor through the insane statements of such people?

The Prophet (PBUH) in answering one of his companions' question of whom was most deserving of the man's companionship, each time the man would ask the Prophet further, "then whom," the Prophet said:
"**Your mother, then your mother, then your mother, then your father**" (Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Abou Hurayra. **Reference**: Saheeh Al Buckhary, **Number**: 5971. **Degree**: Correct.*

Or when the Prophet (PBUH) said:
"**The best of you are the best to their women**" i.e. mother, wife, sisters, and daughters. (Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Abu Hurayra. **Reference**: Al turmezy, **Number**: 1162. **Degree**: Correct/Good.*

Then comes the author with his imaginary or crazy, nameless "hardliners" to tell us about how or how not our own mothers and daughters are perceived in Islam!

"The Suicidal Despair Returns"

On pages 44 and 45 under, the author is trying to portray God's last Prophet, and the perfect example of mankind as a suicidal maniac, then he ends the paragraph - to give credibility to his story - by verses of the Holy Quran which are in Surat (Al Muddather) Chapter 74 verses 1-7, in which it is well - known to be given to the Prophet in relation to the first encounter of the Prophet with Gabriel (PBUH), when he returned home to see Khadija for the first time, shaken to his bones saying:

"**Wrap me with covers, wrap me with covers**"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Jaber ibn Abdu Allah. **Reference**: Saheeh Al Buckhary, **Number**: 4954. **Degree**: Correct.*

The verses told the Prophet that his message is to warn mankind and inform them with the message of their Creator:

(1) O, you (Muhammad (PBUH)) enveloped in cloth.
(2) Arise and warn.
(3) And Say your God is Greater.
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Muddather) Ch (74) verses (1-3)

(1) يَا أَيُّهَا الْمُدَّثِّرُ

(2) قُمْ فَأَنذِرْ

(3) وَرَبَّكَ فَكَبِّرْ

Have we read in the verses anything about committing suicide every day? Did we get a hint of an advice about staying alive as a requirement, because if you were dead, you cannot be the last Prophet of God to mankind?

Then in the last paragraph the author claims that a woman from Quraysh - obviously not a Muslim - had said that when Gabriel didn't appear for some time to the Prophet that:
"His Satan had deserted him"

*Never mind that the most trusted interpretations of the verses of the Holy Quran with pin point "true" historical accuracy, state that what the infidels of Quraysh had said was "His God deserted him."
An example is the respected interpretation of the Holy Quran of Ibn Katheer (Tafseer Ibn Katheer) of the verse in Surat (Al Doha).
In the Holy Quran:

"Your God (O, Muhammad (PBUH)) has neither forsaken you nor resented you"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Doha), Ch (93), verse (3)

(3) مَا وَدَّعَكَ رَبُّكَ وَمَا قَلَىٰ

But let's inspect this; a nameless, non-Muslim woman, obviously a hater of the Prophet and Islam, who never saw the revelation to the

Prophet either false or correct, never saw God, angels or Satan, makes a comment that no one heard or cared for, and we hear it for the first time from the author. Which researcher would even care to consider it, and what scholar would even waste ink rejecting it? And by which wild imagination could this be used to learn any truth about the incident? The answer is, if the goal is to show the last Prophet of God palling with Satan while being a suicide maniac, then our truth-seeker had no choice to use this as an only source for him. Is it a new case of "cause fabricates the means?" You be the judge.

Finally, here is what unbiased objective research says:

"Muhammad received most of his messages from Allah through an angel, whom Muhammad believed to be the Arch Angel Gabriel. For almost two years, Muhammad was afraid to share the messages with anyone other than his wife, Khadija. Eventually, the angel ordered Muhammad to "Recite!" Muhammad finally obeyed the command and, at the age of 42, began his ministry. Incidentally, Jesus referred to a future Prophet numerous times in the New Testament, with a term "paraclete," used to describe the next messenger from God. This term is often translated as "comforter," but it is more probably translated as "advocate" or "counselor."

Christians assert that the advocate is the Holy Spirit, an intangible entity connoting the spirit or word of God. However, the passages related to the advocate plainly reveal that Jesus was describing a flesh and blood person, not a ghost. Moreover, when the Greek word "Paraclete" is translated into Arabic, the world becomes Ahmad (i.e. Muhammad). In sum, Muslims think Jesus foresaw Muhammad. As an impartial seeker of the truth, I must agree with the Muslims. Indeed, Jesus even predicted how the next prophet would receive and share God's message.

"I have much more to tell you, but you cannot bear it now. But when he comes, the spirit of truth, he will guide you to all truth. ***He will not speak on his own, but he will speak what he hears, and will declare to you the***

***things that are coming**. He will glorify me, because he will take from what is mine and declare it to you."*
Gospel of John, Chapter 16: 12-14.

The Oracle Institute in its research book, "The Truth", page 148

"Islam can be considered a break off Judaism and Christianity, and some considered it as such for according to the opinion, that Islam completes them. Fair researchers however say that Islam is the third of the major three religions that complete each other collectively from the same one source"

"To sum it up, Prophet Muhammad brought a monotheistic religion 9 centuries before any Christian brings monotheism into Christianity (Unitarians). No Prophet before or after had such a complete victory like that of Muhammad."

George Sarton, the prominent historian (1884-1956)

Chapter Four

"Muhammad revelations and their sources"

Let's get to the bottom line first!
This entire chapter is desperately dedicated to the attempt of discrediting the Quran as the final unaltered Word of God. That is what the Spencer dance is all about, so, before we even attempt ourselves to shine the truth on the heap of allegations in this chapter, we will first put to eternal rest any illusions about the Quran not being the final true Word of God.

Let's assume that I would come to you today in the year 2010 and tell you that the creator, not only of our planet, but the one creator of a universe that is 13.8 billion light years wide - light can spin planet earth 14 times over in less than a second! - had sent a final messenger with His book of guidance to all mankind, and in it He not only provides the ultimate wisdom for mankind to live the most joyful, satisfying and fulfilling life, but also undisputable proofs scientific and other wise, that he is the creator and most knowledgeable above all his creations; from the atom all the way to the stupendous galaxies in the depth of space. What would you say to that?

The answer would most likely be, "Prove it!"

1- In Surat (Al Mouminoon) (The Believers) Ch (23) Verses (12-14) the most accurate description - even with today's superior knowledge of embryology - of how insemination happens between a sperm and a woman's egg and its phases of growth till a fetus becomes a born baby, are in this Surah (Quran chapter) revealed 1400 years ago.
The description is not only so accurate but also so descriptive in a way that was not revealed by modern science till the advent of electronic microscopes few decades ago. There is no possible explanation that this

was in the Quran 1400 years ago other than that the word of the Quran is the word of the creator of mankind.

"And indeed We created man out of an extract of clay (12). Then We made him as a Nutfah (A mix of the sperm and woman egg) **in a safe lodging** (the womb of the woman) **(13). Then We made the Nutfah into a leech like clot, then We made the clot into a piece of chew, then We made out of that piece of chew bones, then We clothed the bones with flesh, and then We brought it forth as another creation. So Blessed is Allah, the Best of creators (14).**
Quran, Surat (Al Mouminoon) (The Believers) Ch (23) Verses (12-14)

وَلَقَدْ خَلَقْنَا الْإِنسَانَ مِن سُلَالَةٍ مِّن طِينٍ (12)

ثُمَّ جَعَلْنَاهُ نُطْفَةً فِي قَرَارٍ مَّكِينٍ (13)

ثُمَّ خَلَقْنَا النُّطْفَةَ عَلَقَةً فَخَلَقْنَا الْعَلَقَةَ مُضْغَةً فَخَلَقْنَا الْمُضْغَةَ عِظَامًا فَكَسَوْنَا الْعِظَامَ لَحْمًا ثُمَّ أَنشَأْنَاهُ خَلْقًا آخَرَ ۚ فَتَبَارَكَ اللَّهُ أَحْسَنُ الْخَالِقِينَ (14)

Please note two things:
A- The amazing description of the phase "piece of chew," see Fig. 2, p 114, where now, when we look at it with an electronic microscope, it looks exactly like a piece of dough with a teeth mark, as if someone bit or chewed into it! What look like teeth marks are nothing but the beginning of the human backbone line, from which ribs later branch out.

B- Describing the clot as a "Leech," see Fig. 1 and 3, p 113 and 115. Not only does the clot look like a leech, but it latches to the uterus wall and sucks nutrients out of it like a leech does: exactly the same!

C- In Dr. Moore's 2007 embryology reference, it was introduced that now scientists believe that bones are created first in the fetus then it is clothed later by flesh tissues, the creator had told us so 1400 years ago:

"Then We clothed the bones with flesh".
Quran, Surat (Al Mouminoon) (The Believers) Ch (23) Verses (14)

(14) فَكَسَوْنَا الْعِظَامَ لَحْمًا

Are these facts mentioned in any scriptures before the revelation of the Holy Quran?

Did the "Truth-seeker of the sources of the Quran" care to mention this glaring, like the sun, and amazing truth to his readers? Not once.

2- In Surat (Al Anbyaa) (The Prophets) Ch (21) Verse (30)

The "Big Bang" theory was revealed in 1925 and turned our perception of the creation and the beginning of the universe upside down. It stated that the universe was a massive matter then it exploded outward embarking the beginning of the universe as we know it. Let's look at what the Creator - praises be only to Him - had said about His creation.

"Haven't the infidels known that the heavens and the earth were joined together as one piece, and then We tore them apart?"
Quran, Surat (Al Anbyaa) (The Prophets) Ch (21) Verse (30)

(30) أَوَلَمْ يَرَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا أَنَّ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ كَانَتَا رَتْقًا فَفَتَقْنَاهُمَا

The greatness of the verse doesn't stop there, but the creator continues to tell us in the same verse about that which NASA is spending half a billion of dollars looking for today on planet Mars; the only source and proof of life in the universe; water.

"And We have made from water every living thing. Will they not then believe?"
Quran, Surat (Al Anbyaa) (The Prophets) Ch (21) Verse (30)

(30) وَجَعَلْنَا مِنَ الْمَاءِ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ حَيٍّ ۖ أَفَلَا يُؤْمِنُونَ

Will they?

The "Big Bang" theory continues to explain that planets and stars were not formed immediately out of the huge explosion, for in the beginning the universe was in a smoke state then later parts of that smoke got so dense that stars and planets started to form from. Let's see what the creator said about that.

In Surat "Fussilatt" Ch (41) verse (11)

"Then He settled towards the heaven when it was smoke, and said to it and to the earth: "Come willingly or unwillingly." They both said: "We come, willingly"
Quran, Surat "Fussilatt" Ch (41) verse (11)

(11) ثُمَّ اسْتَوَىٰ إِلَى السَّمَاءِ وَهِيَ دُخَانٌ فَقَالَ لَهَا وَلِلْأَرْضِ ائْتِيَا طَوْعًا أَوْ كَرْهًا قَالَتَا أَتَيْنَا طَائِعِينَ

Can you on your own imagine that planets and earth were originally smoke? No, only He who created the universe, heavens and earth billions of years ago could possibly know that.

The latest evolvement of the theory regarding the current condition of the universe is that it is still expanding, as if the initial explosion still echoing at the edges of the universe.

In Surat "Al Zaryat" Ch (51) Verse (47)

"With powers, we did construct the sky, and Verily, We are expanding it"
Quran, Surat "Al Zaryat", Ch (51) Verse (47)

(47) وَالسَّمَاءَ بَنَيْنَاهَا بِأَيْدٍ وَإِنَّا لَمُوسِعُونَ

Never mind that no one at the time - seventh century - even knew the existence of half of the planet, but who other than the creator of the universe would not only know the scope of its creation and existence but in addition the changing condition of its size and edges?

Then comes the several times in the Quran when the creator swears by the towers in the skies and heavens; see Fig. 5, p 117.
Many old interpretations of the Quran tried to explain the greatness of these towers that Allah swears by, as may be constellation of stars, planets or more frequently as the final dwelling of the righteous in paradise. Then comes NASA, who recently and after receiving Hubble telescope images from the far depth of space into other galaxies; in the documentary "cosmic voyage" narrated by the Oscar award winner Morgan Freeman, NASA reveals to us these light-years-high "mysterious towers of gas" where gases get so dense inside giving birth to stars as if they were gigantic "Star nurseries" See Fig. 5 p 117!
In the Quran:

"And indeed, We have put towers in the heavens and We beautified them for the beholders"
Quran, Surat (Al Hejr) (The mind) Ch (15) Verse (16)

وَلَقَدْ جَعَلْنَا فِي السَّمَاءِ بُرُوجًا وَزَيَّنَّاهَا لِلنَّاظِرِينَ (16)

"And by the heaven of the towers".
Quran, Surat (Al Boroo) (The towers) Ch 85 Verse (1)

وَالسَّمَاءِ ذَاتِ الْبُرُوجِ (1)

With a plethora of other proofs, in the subject of the universe and its creation alone, we can dedicate an entire multiple volume book on the scientific miracles of the Quran.

In Surat (Al Roum) (The Romans) Verses (2 -4):

"The Romans have been defeated (2)
In the lowest land, and they, after their defeat, will be victorious (3)
Within few years ... (4)"
Surat (Al Roum) (The Romans) Ch. (30) Verses (2 -4)

غُلِبَتِ الرُّومُ (2)
فِي أَدْنَى الْأَرْضِ وَهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ غَلَبِهِمْ سَيَغْلِبُونَ (3)
فِي بِضْعِ سِنِينَ ۗ لِلَّهِ الْأَمْرُ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَمِنْ بَعْدُ ۚ وَيَوْمَئِذٍ يَفْرَحُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ (4)

Why would Muhammad (PBUH) if he is the author of Quran, get out of his own way and predict that the Romans not only will be defeated first, but then within 9 years will be victorious again? What if the opposite happened, the events never happened at all, or happened in a reversed sequence? And if it wasn't miraculous enough that it did happen exactly as God who knows the future had already told in the Quran, then look at the description that the defeat of the Romans will happen in the lowest earth. Then, come modern scientists with satellite scanning technology to tell us that the site of the battle where the Muslims had defeated the Romans - first - by the shore of the Dead Sea in today's Jordan - is typographically the lowest point on the surface of earth!
One can puzzle himself till the day he dies of the question "How is it possible that Muhammad (PBUH) knew that 1400 years ago?"
Or one can simply realize that it is impossible for anyone but the creator of heavens and earth to foretell these facts, for he is all knower of the planet He created and the future?
In the Quran there are hundreds more of similar undeniable proofs.

Now let's see what Mr. Spencer, the "truth-seeker", is claiming about the subject!

As the old adage says, "The first word of the poem is blasphemy"!

"Borrowings from Judaism"

In the first paragraph on page 47, Mr. Spencer starts this chapter, by stating that there is a:
"most severe and lingering challenge to Muhammad's claim to be a Prophet."

*If we can call this a challenge! He claims that there are similarities between Judaism, Christianity and Islam, that there are

similarities between Judaism and Islam in Monotheism, and basic laws. Then the blue elephant of a statement comes flying - as usual - about the Jewish tribes around Mecca; that Muhammad (PBUH) respected them and sought their approval of his Prophetic mission!

*Mr. Spencer - in writing - is making such a serious accusation. An accusation that the world's second largest religion came through the approval of the leaders of another religion and through the adherence of the Prophet of Islam to its leaders!!

With that unbelievably weird claim, would the author show us any supporting evidence to even attempt to slow us down? Not one iota! Does he have the audacity to throw such a claim up in the air then just move to the next paragraph?
Yes he did.

*What would a Prophet of God do?
Should he destroy the message of all Prophets - of the same God - before him?! Did David, Joseph, Moses, and Jesus, may peace be upon all of them, do that about laws, and messages, of Prophets that were sent before them?

As per the Bible Jesus (PBUH) said:
"I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"
King James Bible, Mathew 15:24

Does this mean that Jesus (PBUH) is not a Prophet of God for his mission was to bring the lost sheep of the house of Israel back to the mosaic laws, i.e. upholding the true religion that was revealed by Moses before him?

If God is One that has no partner (Monotheism) which is the number one fundamental pillar of Islam and truly for all of the Abrahamic religions, where does it say that Muhammad has to denounce the oneness of God (Monotheism) as proof of his new Prophethood?
If God did not send Prophets after messengers after Prophets to support

his eternal message of his oneness, and enhance his previous laws to mankind as mankind evolved, what would be the need of all those Prophets and messengers one after the other, then?
Why send Moses after Abraham? Why then send Jesus to begin with, after all the Old Testament Prophets and messengers were sent with all their Scriptures and laws?

In the next paragraph the author - again - wonders why the stories of Prophets are similar in the Quran to the ones in the Bible and the Old Testament!

*The same one mighty God, who has sent all Prophets and messengers, has sent his last Prophet; now should his last Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) claim, as proof of his Prophethood and that he is the last messenger of the same Mighty God, that Moses (PBUH) had parted the Pacific Ocean instead of the Red Sea? Or that David (PBUH) was defeated by Goliath?
A minimum of common sense would be the absolute opposite, meaning that if the stories of the Quran were totally dissimilar to the Bible about the same events, then that would have raised questions - with non-Muslims - yet majority of the stories are generally the same, and in itself is another confirmation among thousands of them, that he is the last Prophet (PBUH) of the same One Mighty God of all Prophets and messengers sent before him, completing and enhancing the same message of God once and for all.

*Dissimilarities in the Quran

When comparing the stories of God's Prophets in the Quran to the ones included in the Bible we would generally find that the common thread is the same, yet there are unavoidable differences:

1-The stories in the Quran are purified from the man-made fabrications and accusations against the Prophets of God. Please review the beginning of this chapter proving the Quran as the undeniable Word

of God. A glaring example is some of the fabrications like those in the story of David (PBUH) where he was accused of sending one of his army leaders to his death in battle so he can marry his wife - that is a Prophet of God they are talking about - or that Lot (PBUH) had an incestuous relationship with his daughters, etc.
In the Quran, the honor and the record of God's Prophets, the best humans that ever walked the earth, was restored once and for all.
Examples in the Quran:

"Oh Family of David, do (righteous deeds) thankfully, and few of my worshippers are truly the thankful"
Quran, Surat (Saba) Ch 34, verse (13)

اعْمَلُوا آلَ دَاوُودَ شُكْرًا ۚ وَقَلِيلٌ مِنْ عِبَادِيَ الشَّكُورُ (13) ۚ

In the verse, David (PBUH) had made a schedule for his family to praise and worship God all day and all night, so there was always one person in his household praising God at all times. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) says of David (PBUH):

"The best fasting was the fasting of my brother David, for he used to fast every other day and eat the next, and he never fled if confronted in battle" (Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abdu Allah Ibn Alaas. ***Reference****: Saheeh Al Tarmazy,* ***Number****: 70.*
Degree*: Correct.*

Can you imagine that this Great Prophet of God, who was commissioned by God to tell mankind right from wrong, is some man who lusts for another man's wife, plotting the death of her husband!

2- There are more stories and events that God revealed in the Quran about his Prophets that were never included in the Bible, as in the story of Moses in Surat (Al Kahf) (The Cave) (chapter 18), as well as others mentioned in the quotations of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) in addition to him (PBUH) elaborating on some of these events.

3- One of the most glaring parts of the story of Prophets that were never mentioned anywhere except in the Quran is the verse in Surat Younis (Jonas) where God talks to Moses's Pharoe after he has drowned and stating a fact that modern science had discovered recently.

In the late eighties, a group of French scientists performed tissue analysis on the mummy of what was believed to be the Pharaoh Ramses the second, the lead scientist (Maurice Bukaille) thought that he made the discovery of the century when he declared to his colleagues that the body of Moses's Pharaoh was saved and that it is the body of Ramses the second. He found sea salt all over the tissues, broken ribs and no skin scars as a result of drowning under a crushing water weight, and apparent rushed mummification of the body.
Before the scientist raced to declare his discovery to the world, he was told by a colleague that Muslims knew that fact 1400 years ago.

The body of the Pharaoh was saved! Is this mentioned anywhere else other than the Quran?

"So this day, We shall save your body so that you may be made an example of (Sign from God) to those who come after you"
Quran, Surat (Younis) Ch (10) Verse (92)

On page 49, the author brings the verses in the Quran that tells the story of Adam's two sons, Cain and Abel (Qabeel and Habeel in Arabic), where Cain killed his brother Abel, then Allah had sent a raven to bury a dead one before Cain to show him how to bury the body of his dead brother.

*In the Quran verses that told the aove mentioned story (27-31) are immediately followed by the famous verse No 32 that says:

"Because of that We ordained for the children of Israel that if anyone killed a soul not in punishment for killing another soul, or spreading mischief on earth, it would be as if he killed all mankind,

and if anyone saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of all mankind. And indeed, there came to them Our Messengers with clear proofs, but, even then many of them continued to exceed the limits"

Quran Surat (Al Maeda) (The table) Ch (5) Verse (32)

مِنْ أَجْلِ ذَٰلِكَ كَتَبْنَا عَلَىٰ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ أَنَّهُ مَنْ قَتَلَ نَفْسًا بِغَيْرِ نَفْسٍ أَوْ فَسَادٍ فِي الْأَرْضِ فَكَأَنَّمَا قَتَلَ النَّاسَ جَمِيعًا وَمَنْ أَحْيَاهَا فَكَأَنَّمَا أَحْيَا النَّاسَ جَمِيعًا ۚ وَلَقَدْ جَاءَتْهُمْ رُسُلُنَا بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ ثُمَّ إِنَّ كَثِيرًا مِنْهُمْ بَعْدَ ذَٰلِكَ فِي الْأَرْضِ لَمُسْرِفُونَ (32)

Here the author really dazzles us, when he wonders:
"There is no stated reason why this injunction against murder follows the story of Cain and Abel"

*Can you believe that after telling the story of the first murder in the history of mankind; a brother killing his own brother, Mr. Spencer wonders why the following verse condemns murder?! As bizarre as that sounds, I'll show you why he said that.

The author runs to bring a story about the mentioning of the raven in the Talmud - which was gathered in the second century B.C - eluding that Muhammad had copied it from the Jews!
And by that he pushes smoke on a gun that was never fired, and more importantly when none was shot to begin with!

Then he goes back to his previous question as to why the Quran - God for that matter - doesn't always explain everything in it in details, which we have answered already in this book. The author imagines that the explanation of the Quranic verse as to why killing one person is like killing all mankind and vice versa, can only be explained by the Talmud where the story of the two brothers is mentioned!
On page 49, he wrote:
"The voice of thy brothers bloods crieth" (Gen 4:10)
and because the word "bloods" was in plural not in singular, then on page 50 he adds:
"...suggests to numerous readers across centuries that the Quran author or compiler was depending on the Jewish source"!

*Did the Verse in the Quran contain one word about "blood" either way? No.

Then on page 50 he explains again that the Talmud refers to the killed brother as a seed of many people to have been born yet, so by killing him it is like killing his lineage as well, and that is the connection.
*I will not use the fact that the Quran is the true unaltered Word of God which Biblical stories should actually be verified by, but I will follow the same logic the author has been trying to use.
Was the seed of killed Abel the seed that would have produced mankind? No, we are here, me and you and another 6 billion people; yes he was killed, yet none of us obviously comes from his seed.
Is it mentioned anywhere that Cain didn't carry his own seed or that he was impotent in any way so he never had any children; hence the death of his only brother was like killing all mankind? No.
Is there any undeniable proof that Adam (PBUH) didn't have any other sons or daughters who reproduced? No.

Then that cannot be what God meant in the Quran when he says killing one is killing all.

Did the author read the Quranic verse itself? It says **"We ordained for the Children of Israel",** the whole statement of God in this Quranic verse is a law ordained to the sons of Jacob - Israel - (PBUH), that is tens of generations after Adam (PBUH) and his two sons, to begin with!

But then what is the meaning of the verse in the Quran? And how is it that killing one man is like killing all? The meaning closest to the truth, is that killing a soul that God had created is such an abomination and transgression against God that it equals killing all mankind and vice versa. Some scholars also explain that, to the killed, meaning, in the point of view of the killed, the entire world had died, and to the saved soul then, the entire world was revived again. But then, these true Muslim scholars are never included amongst the author's nameless "numerous readers across centuries"!

The clear fact is that if a story is in the Quran and the Talmud as well, it means without a doubt that it did happen, more importantly that this is the normal thing if it did happen, for the one Mighty God would tell the same event, naturally, the same way in the multiple of scriptures, and the ultimate reference here is the Quran itself, the last unaltered Word of God.

"Tales of the ancients"

How about someone who commits a crime and goes public with what he believes a claim for his innocence, only to bring with it the overwhelming proof of his absolute guilt?

The author brings the verses in the Holy Quran that state what the infidels of Quraysh had falsely claimed about the Quran, that the Quran had tales like the tales of the ancients (old scriptures), and that these tales have been dictated to Muhammad (PBUH) day and night, and that he was receiving help from others authoring it!
Please note that Muhammad (PBUH) died illiterate, didn't know how to read or write (MZ)

Is it uncanny that the claims of the infidels That God mentions in the Quran are almost exactly the same claims Mr. Spencer just mentioned in his previous paragraph 14 centuries later?

Does he realize what he might be saying and quoting from the Quran about his ownself?

A side note: If you walked into Mecca before Muhammad's Prophetic mission and asked anyone, where is the "Truthful honest?" You would never be pointed to three or two choices of men; you would have always been pointed to one man that is Muhammad (PBUH).

Here we will quote the same verses the "author" quoted, only with an honest accurate translation.

"Verily, this we have been promised (resurrection) we and our fathers before (us), this is only the tales of the ancients"
Quran, Surat (Al Mouminoon) (The Believers) Ch (9) verse (83)

لَقَدْ وُعِدْنَا نَحْنُ وَآبَاؤُنَا هَٰذَا مِن قَبْلُ إِنْ هَٰذَا إِلَّا أَسَاطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ (83)

(4) "Those who disbelieve say: "This (the Quran) is nothing but a lie that he (Muhammad) has invented, and others have helped him at it. In fact they have produced oppression and a fabrication"
(5) And they say: "Tales of the ancients, which he has written down, and they are dictated to him morning and afternoon."
(6) Say: "It (Quran) has been sent down by Him (Allah) Who knows the secret in the heavens and the earth. Truly, He is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."
Quran, Surat (Al Furqan) Ch. (25), verses (4-6)

وَقَالَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِنْ هَٰذَا إِلَّا إِفْكٌ افْتَرَاهُ وَأَعَانَهُ عَلَيْهِ قَوْمٌ آخَرُونَ ۖ فَقَدْ جَاءُوا ظُلْمًا وَزُورًا (4)

وَقَالُوا أَسَاطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ اكْتَتَبَهَا فَهِيَ تُمْلَىٰ عَلَيْهِ بُكْرَةً وَأَصِيلًا (5)

قُلْ أَنْزَلَهُ الَّذِي يَعْلَمُ السِّرَّ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ ۚ إِنَّهُ كَانَ غَفُورًا رَحِيمًا (6)

And of them there are some who listen to you; but We have set veils on their hearts, so they do not understand, and deafness in their ears; and even if they see every one of the signs, they will not believe; to the point that when they come to you to argue with you, the disbelievers say: "These are nothing but tales of the ancients."
Quran, Surat (Al Anaam) Ch (6), verse (25)

وَمِنْهُم مَّن يَسْتَمِعُ إِلَيْكَ ۖ وَجَعَلْنَا عَلَىٰ قُلُوبِهِمْ أَكِنَّةً أَن يَفْقَهُوهُ وَفِي آذَانِهِمْ وَقْرًا ۖ وَإِن يَرَوْا كُلَّ آيَةٍ لَّا يُؤْمِنُوا بِهَا ۖ حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءُوكَ يُجَادِلُونَكَ يَقُولُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِنْ هَٰذَا إِلَّا أَسَاطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ (25)

The author claims in the following verses that Muhammad (PBUH) reacted with "fury", where there is no record of that furious reaction whatsoever. The author never mentions what is the source of that "fury" incident! The clear text in the following verses shows the well known and always declared fact that God, not Muhammad, may strike the

infidels and shows how false that "Fury" claim is. In the Holy Quran (our translation):

[10] **"And (O Muhammad (PBUH), do not obey every lying swearer.**
[11] **A slanderer, going about with obscenities,**
[12] **Hinderer of the good, sinful transgressor,**
[13] **Cruel, and moreover of illegitimate birth.**
[14] **(Do not obey him) even if he had wealth and children.**
[15] **When Our Verses (of the Quran) are recited to him, he says: "Tales of the ancients**
[16] **We shall strike him on the nose"**
Quran, Surat (Al Qalam) (The Penn) Ch (68), verse (10-16)

وَلَا تُطِعْ كُلَّ حَلَّافٍ مَهِينٍ (10)

هَمَّازٍ مَشَّاءٍ بِنَمِيمٍ (11)

مَنَّاعٍ لِلْخَيْرِ مُعْتَدٍ أَثِيمٍ (12)

عُتُلٍّ بَعْدَ ذَٰلِكَ زَنِيمٍ (13)

أَنْ كَانَ ذَا مَالٍ وَبَنِينَ (14)

إِذَا تُتْلَىٰ عَلَيْهِ آيَاتُنَا قَالَ أَسَاطِيرُ الْأَوَّلِينَ (15)

سَنَسِمُهُ عَلَى الْخُرْطُومِ (16)

"And those who disbelieved, say: "(O, Muhammad (PBUH) you are not a Messenger." Say: "Allah is Sufficient a witness between me and you and those who have knowledge of the Scripture too"
Quran, Surat (Al Raad) (The Thunder) Ch. (13), verses (43)

وَيَقُولُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا لَسْتَ مُرْسَلًا ۚ قُلْ كَفَىٰ بِاللَّهِ شَهِيدًا بَيْنِي وَبَيْنَكُمْ وَمَنْ عِنْدَهُ عِلْمُ الْكِتَابِ (43)

"Those to whom We gave the Scriptures before it (the Quran), they believe in it (the Quran) and only the disbelievers would deny it"
Quran, Surat (Al Ankabout) Ch. (29), verses (47)

فَالَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِهِ ۖ وَمِنْ هَٰؤُلَاءِ مَنْ يُؤْمِنُ بِهِ ۚ وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِآيَاتِنَا إِلَّا الْكَافِرُونَ (47)

One of the rampant practices of Muslim-Bashers is when they quote a part of a verse - often mistranslated - that fits the image they want to portray, they never quote you the verse before or the verse after, for that will give context and truth. The author didn't see a reason why to quote the verse that immediately follows!

"And when it is recited to them (people who have knowledge of the old scriptures), they say: "We believe in it. Verily, it is the truth from our Lord. Indeed even before it, we have been from those who submit themselves to Allah as Muslims"
Quran, Surat (Al Furqan) Ch (28), verses (53)

(وَإِذَا يُتْلَىٰ عَلَيْهِمْ قَالُوا آمَنَّا بِهِ إِنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّنَا إِنَّا كُنَّا مِنْ قَبْلِهِ مُسْلِمِينَ (53)

The next verse the author quoted is interesting! (Our translation):
"And do not argue with the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians), unless it with the better way, except those who are oppressors amongst them; and say (to them): "We believe in that which has been revealed to us and revealed to you; our God and your God is One (Allah), and to Him we have submitted as Muslims."
Quran, Surat (Al Ankaboot) (The Spider) Ch (29), verses (46)

وَلَا تُجَادِلُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مِنْهُمْ ۖ وَقُولُوا آمَنَّا بِالَّذِي أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَأُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ وَإِلَٰهُنَا وَإِلَٰهُكُمْ وَاحِدٌ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ (46)

This is how the author translated the same exact verse 46, above:

In page 51 he wrote:
"Those who did not convert to Islam should be reminded that Muslims, Christians, and Jews all worship the same deity" Quran 29 [46]"

*The entire first part of the verse **"And do not argue with the people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians), unless it with the better way,**

except those who are oppressors amongst them" is totally and intentionally omitted!

Why the screaming mistranslation and misinformation? Because the beginning of the verse reveals an order from God to Muslims, to always communicate with leniency and peace with Christians and Jews, except - of course - when dealing with the oppressors amongst them, and that doesn't fit the image of a demonized jihadist Muslim that should kill a Jew or a Christian every day after breakfast! Not to mention that the word "convert" that the author concocted out of thin air in his translation doesn't exist in the verse to begin with.

I won't have to tell you why – again - did the author choose not to include this verse that immediately followed!

"Those to whom We gave the Scriptures before it (the Quran), they believe in it (the Quran) and only the disbelievers would deny it"
Quran, Surat (Al Ankabout) Ch. (29), verses (47)

فَالَّذِينَ آتَيْنَاهُمُ الْكِتَابَ يُؤْمِنُونَ بِهِ وَمِنْ هَؤُلَاءِ مَنْ يُؤْمِنُ بِهِ وَمَا يَجْحَدُ بِآيَاتِنَا إِلَّا الْكَافِرُونَ (47

Then the author quotes the following verse which is always an easy one for Muslim-haters, yet refuting the misinterpretation is even easier with fact. Let's see what the truth-seeker says about it?

On Page 51 he wrote:
"Allah even tells Muhammad to consult with the Jews and Christians if he doubts the truth of what he has been receiving: "And if thou (Muhammad) art in doubt concerning that which we reveal unto thee, then question those who read the scripture (that was) before thee. Verily the truth from thy lord hath come unto thee. So be not thou of the waverers" Quran 10:94" "

*Here is the correct translation:

"So if you (Muhammad) **are in doubt concerning that which We have revealed unto you, then ask those who were reading the Book** (Old Scriptures before you)**. Verily, the truth has come to you from your**

Lord. So do not be amongst the doubters"
Quran, Surat (Youness) Ch(10), Verse (94)

فَإِنْ كُنْتَ فِي شَكٍّ مِمَّا أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ فَاسْأَلِ الَّذِينَ يَقْرَءُونَ الْكِتَابَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ ۚ لَقَدْ جَاءَكَ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَبِّكَ فَلَا تَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِينَ (94)

*Any word about "consulting"? No.

Any reason why the author would change a simple no second guess meaning of a word like "Ask" into "Question" as if Muhammad is doubtful, or is to inquire with a higher authority to learn?

Every single leading interpretation of the Quran - Ibn Katheer, Al Galalayn, Al Tabary, and Al Qurtoby - had the correct interpretation of the above verse evidenced by the correct context of the statements of the companions of the Prophet (PBUH). Why would the truth-seeker, ignore them all?

Here is the interpretation of the leading Muslim scholars:

God said in the above verses that the coming of Muhammad is foretold in the old scriptures - the original ones - and if Muhammad had doubts that his name and his imminent coming is there, he can go and ask the people of the old scriptures to "read" it for him, so he may not have any doubt about it.

In the King James Bible (Muhammad's name is in the original Hebrew text):

"His mouth is most sweet: yea, he is "Muhamad'em". This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O, daughters of Jerusalem."
King James Bible, Song of Songs 5:16

Can things be simpler than the truth? Please note that in the English translation of the King James Bible the word "Muhammad" is translated to; are you ready? It is translated to "All great and lovely"!!

In addition, the fact that, Qutada, a companion of the Prophet (PBUH) had stated that Muhammad never doubted or asked anyone of the people of the scriptures, the same confirmation came from the great scholar of the followers Saeed Ibn Gobair that Muhammad never doubted or asked. But then why the question from God, even though

God knows the faith strength of his Prophet and the future fact that Muhammad will never doubt or ask others about his faith?
Let's go to another conversation in the Quran with another great Prophet of God.

"And when Allah says "O 'Eissa (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary) did you say to people: 'Worship me and my mother as two gods besides Allah?' "He will say: "Glory be to You, It was not for me to say what I had no right to say. Had I said such a thing, You would surely have known it. You know what is in my inner-self though I do not know what is in Yours: truly, You, only You, are the All-Knower of all that is unknown."
Surat, (Al Maeda) Ch (5) Verse (116)

وَإِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يَا عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ أَأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمِّيَ إِلَٰهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ ۖ قَالَ سُبْحَانَكَ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَقُولَ مَا لَيْسَ لِي بِحَقٍّ ۚ إِنْ كُنْتُ قُلْتُهُ فَقَدْ عَلِمْتَهُ ۚ تَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِي وَلَا أَعْلَمُ مَا فِي نَفْسِكَ ۚ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ عَلَّامُ الْغُيُوبِ (116)

Why would Allah ask Jesus this question? Surely he knows the answer! The reason is that yes, the question is asked to Jesus, but in actuality it is directed to us, readers of the Quran in all times about the true nature of Jesus and Virgin Mary. The same way is our verse in question; the statement is told to Muhammad, yet it is directed to and to inform all of us.

So there is no "obstinacy from the people of the book that kept them from recognizing Muhammad" as the author claimed later, not to mention that the approval or disapproval of some or all of the minority Christians or Jews in the Arab Peninsula, made no difference in the exponential growth of Islam at any point in history. Today there are about 15 million Jews, and over 1.6 billion Muslims worldwide, as well as the Vatican stating that today there are more Muslims in the world than Catholics.
The author in the next Paragraph creates a conflict that never existed except in his imagined reasons, and to prove his claims he uses the one

great verse that ironically can only be used to hang his allegation by the neck. It is verse 110 in Surat Al Omran, Ch (3)

"You are the best nation that was ever brought up for mankind; you demand virtue and prohibit vice, and you believe in Allah. And had the people of the Scripture believed, it would have been better for them; among them are believers, but most of them are corruptors"
Quran, Surat (Al Omran) Ch (3) Verse (110)

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ ۗ وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ ۚ مِنْهُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَأَكْثَرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ (110)

In this Great Verse God states one of the great known Islamic fundamentals, that no one is better than anyone except by fearing God in what they do, meaning that preference in the eyes of Allah, is based only upon an ethical standard, not gender, race, fake holiness, nor even for just solely being a Muslim like the author attempts to convince you.
Even believing in God - as Muslims - came second to the ethical standard of actual deeds. Can the author tell me with a straight face that a Muslim nation that doesn't demand virtue and prohibit vice could automatically be the best nation that was ever brought to mankind according to this verse? Not even him!
The author ends this paragraph by stating his motto that Jihadists (his favorite people) around the world state that only by observing Islam, Muslims can be the best nation!
*Do we need unionists, vegetarians, or even his imaginary Jihadist crazies to inform us that God prefers the manners of the righteous over the manners of the not-righteous?!

"Borrowings from Christianity"

How easy it is to validate a fabrication by using laughable excuses like "some sources say," "others suggested that," " some charged," or "some modern scholars contend" without listing any source or telling who, when, or what those imaginary "some" are?

On page, 52, the first paragraph, the author wonders why that Warqa, the "Arab" scholar who is related to the Prophet's wife and who recognized Prophet Muhammad as the promised Prophet in the Bible:
"writes the Bible not in Hebrew but in Arabic".
*An Arab writing in Arabic, what a conspiracy!
The author explains the plot of Warqa not writing the Bible in Hebrew because:
"Might be to distance Warqa from the Jews, who, some charged were teaching Muhammad the Quran"

*Just by saying that, the author is assuming that it was a fact that Warqa taught Muhammad, and that all the narrators of the quotations of the Prophet knew this as a fact and that all - in addition- conspired to cover it up! Who said that Warqa was a Jew? What we know is that he was Khadija the Prophet's wife's cousin and she was of course an Arab, if she was an Arab, then what would that likely make her cousin?
First of all, would an Arab writing his Bible in Arabic be a wonder?
Secondly, and regardless, all accounts indicate the passing of Warqa shortly after the first revelation to Muhammad by Arch-Angel Gabriel.
Thirdly and most importantly, if Warqa acted as a volunteered private "author" of the magnificent Word of God that is the Quran to Muhammad, what was he waiting for, him or whatever Jew, Persian or even Red-Indian our author may claim to have taught Muhammad the Quran? What was he waiting for to declare himself a Prophet of God instead of Muhammad? Can Muhammad (PBUH) - God forbid - possibly lie to people about the truth of his Prophethood, yet his imaginary teachers and writers who are feeding him the lies - according to some sources! - won't tell the supposed truth that they are the actual writers and origin of it all! Why give the glory to Muhammad and not keep it for their ownselves?

The author then quotes the following verse: (our correct translation, not his)

" And indeed We know that they (polytheists and pagans) say: "It is only a human being who teaches him (Muhammad) The tongue of the man they refer to is foreign, while this (the Quran) is a clear Arabic tongue"
Quran, Surat (Al Nahl) Ch (16) Verse (103)

وَلَقَدْ نَعْلَمُ أَنَّهُمْ يَقُولُونَ إِنَّمَا يُعَلِّمُهُ بَشَرٌ ۗ لِّسَانُ الَّذِي يُلْحِدُونَ إِلَيْهِ أَعْجَمِيٌّ وَهَٰذَا لِسَانٌ عَرَبِيٌّ مُّبِينٌ (103)

While the word Ajami in the Arabic text means "foreign" the author ventured to tell the Arabs the meaning of their own vocabulary by saying that "Ajami means Persian or Iranian"!!
Never mind that in Arabic the word "Ajami" means anything foreign to an Arab; does the author know that there was no Iran or Iranian at the time of the Prophet? Even nowadays Iranians speak Persian, so is the author saying that all foreign languages of the world at the time to the Prophet other than Arabic were only Persian, so anything foreign was Persian? That is also like someone saying that a word coincidentally means the same in English or American!
The author Quotes the Word of God in the above verse, but does he read his own English?
God says in the Verse, that how could a non-Arab teach the most complex and most fascinating text in the Arabic language ever read? And I repeat the same question to the author!

The author in page 53, ventures to say that Warqa's confirmation to the Muhammad's Prophetic mission "has been a source of embarrassment to Muslims."

*Why is it an embarrassment?!
In most of the verses that we mentioned in this chapter and the ones the author himself quoted, God states many times that the coming of Muhammad as the last Prophet of God was mentioned in the Old Scriptures.

"Those who follow the Messenger, the Prophet who can neither read nor write, whom they find written with them in the Torah and the Injeel (Gospel)"
Quran, Surat (Al Aaraf) Ch 7, Verse (157)

الَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ الرَّسُولَ النَّبِيَّ الْأُمِّيَّ الَّذِي يَجِدُونَهُ مَكْتُوبًا عِنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَاةِ (157)

So when a Christian scholar confirms and attests to the fact, why is it an embarrassment to Muslims? Can anyone tell us at least from the standpoint of Muslims themselves?

Had that been enough of a circus ride for one chapter already? No. The author quotes his invisible hidden sources saying that "some modern scholars contend that Warqa actually rejected Muhammad"!

*A second ago the Muslims were embarrassed by Warqa confirming Muhammad as a Prophet, now it is the opposite; Warqa has now rejected Muhammad?!
And if he did, who said that every Christian and Jew of the Arab Peninsula did believe in Muhammad? And if one Christian rejected him, does that mean that the rest of the population would follow?
The author then claims the possibility that the account of Ibn Hisham was specifically corrupt when it came to the story of Warqa, then moves to why there are no details of the conversion of Warqa to Islam, even though - in his opinion - it "would have been a momentous event"!

*No Hadeeth (quotations of the Prophet) scholar worth his weight would argue that the Seerah (biography of the prophet) of Ibn Hisham without a doubt is heavens higher of credibility than the remnants of the Seerah of Ibn Ishaq, and while the reader will soon discover for himself that the author overwhelmingly uses Ibn Ishaq's well known fabricated stories, the author comes here and criticizes the credibility of the story of Warqa according to Ibn Hisham!

As we said earlier, most narrators verify the passing of Warqa shortly after the first revelation to Muhammad. The overwhelming majority of the religion of Islam as Quran, quotations and laws was not

even revealed when Warqa passed away. At that junction of time then, believing in the one mighty God and his messenger - confirming him for that matter- was all that was needed to be accepted by Allah for one to be a Muslim.

A side note (MZ):

In painful details, the quotations of the Prophet's all over Islamic history references, describe the event of the Prophet's uncle Abu Taleb totally refusing Shahada and dying a non-Muslim. Abu Taleb, who raised and sponsored the Prophet, never accepted Muhammad's pleas on his death bed to declare Shahada (declare the oneness of God and that Muhammad is his Messenger so he becomes a Muslim before his passing) and instead listened to his pagan friends' pleas not to change his ancestors' religion before his passing. The event that saddened Muhammad enough to be the occasion for Allah to reveal the great verse:

"You do not guide whomever you want, but it is Allah who guides whomever he wills"
Quran Surat (Al Qassass) Ch (28) Verse (56)

إِنَّكَ لَا تَهْدِي مَنْ أَحْبَبْتَ وَلَٰكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ ۚ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ (56)

What Warqa, Christian, Jew or atheist becoming or never becoming a Muslim that can be compared to the Prophet's own uncle and sponsor?
That was the Prophet's uncle and sponsor refusing the guidance of God and dying a non-Muslim, yet for Muslim scholars; it is always about stating the truth, only the truth: "momentous" or otherwise.

On page 55, the author goes to the one issue that separates Pauline Christianity from both true Christianity and Islam, which is the nature of Jesus (PBUH) and the claimed crucifixion.
In the Quran, Jesus (PBUH) is a mighty Prophet of Islam; he is created from the Holy Spirit and from a Word of God given to Virgin Mary (PBUH), yet it is the most major of sins to call him God or associate him, Virgin Mary, anyone, or thing with God.

The really odd situation is when Mr. Spencer who spearheads the ideology that anything Muslim is anti-Christianity, totally ignores the many more powers and miracles that God gave Jesus (PBUH), stated in the Quran than the Bible, and resorts to the Infancy Arabic Bible that indicated some of the same miracles of Jesus (PBUH) mentioned in the Quran.

A side note (MZ):

Some go as far as counting about 100 different Gospels, yet the Encyclopedia Britannica researchers state that there are at least 26 different Gospels of which the church of the Roman Empire had chosen only 4 as Today's Bible. I will leave to Christian scholars the historical question: Did the Roman Empire determine the word of God?

The infancy Gospel which is unique into describing the infancy of Jesus (PBUH) in more details than the others is what Mr. Spencer is talking about and which he will later describe as heresy! According to whose evidence I, really want to ask?

*According to the author's logic, since the Infancy "Arabic" Bible is associated with what he calls "Christian heretical groups" then it is all wrong and so is any similarity in it to the truth in the Quran, he then adds:

"Muhammad's experiences with Christian heretical groups may also explain his view of the crucifixion of Christ"?!

<u>*The one great miracle of Jesus (PBUH) that is only told in the Quran.</u>

It is the miracle of the just born Jesus (PBUH), talking and defending Virgin Mary when confronted by her people. Here are the verses in the Quran that describes how it happened:

[27] "Then she brought him (just born Jesus) to her people, carrying him. They said: "O Mary, Indeed you have brought a mighty sin.
[28] "O sister of Aaron, your father was not a man who commits adultery, nor was your mother an unchaste woman."

[29] Then she pointed to him. They said: "How can we talk to one who is a child in the cradle?"
[30] He (Jesus) said: Verily I am a servant of Allah, He has given me the Scripture and made me a Prophet;"
[31] And He has made me blessed wherever I be, and has enjoined on me Salah (prayer), and Zakah (obligated charity), as long as I live."
[32] And dutiful to my mother, and did not make me an unblessed arrogant.
[33] And peace be upon me the day I was born, and the day I die, and the day I shall be raised alive!
[34] Such is Jesus, son of Maryam. The statement of truth, about which they dispute"

Quran, Surat (Maryam) (Mary) Ch (19) Verses (27-34)

فَأَتَتْ بِهِ قَوْمَهَا تَحْمِلُهُ ۖ قَالُوا يَا مَرْيَمُ لَقَدْ جِئْتِ شَيْئًا فَرِيًّا (27)
يَا أُخْتَ هَارُونَ مَا كَانَ أَبُوكِ امْرَأَ سَوْءٍ وَمَا كَانَتْ أُمُّكِ بَغِيًّا (28)
فَأَشَارَتْ إِلَيْهِ ۖ قَالُوا كَيْفَ نُكَلِّمُ مَنْ كَانَ فِي الْمَهْدِ صَبِيًّا (29)
قَالَ إِنِّي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ آتَانِيَ الْكِتَابَ وَجَعَلَنِي نَبِيًّا (30)
وَجَعَلَنِي مُبَارَكًا أَيْنَ مَا كُنْتُ وَأَوْصَانِي بِالصَّلَاةِ وَالزَّكَاةِ مَا دُمْتُ حَيًّا (31)
وَبَرًّا بِوَالِدَتِي وَلَمْ يَجْعَلْنِي جَبَّارًا شَقِيًّا (32)
وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَيَّ يَوْمَ وُلِدْتُ وَيَوْمَ أَمُوتُ وَيَوْمَ أُبْعَثُ حَيًّا (33)
ذَٰلِكَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ ۚ قَوْلَ الْحَقِّ الَّذِي فِيهِ يَمْتَرُونَ (34)

*Naturally any similar miracles or events in that infancy Arabic Bible would also be true since it is also mentioned in the ultimate reference, the Quran, the true Word of God. Yet, apparently to the author, more power and miracles in the Quran, that are not mentioned in today's Bible; miracles that add to the reverence of Jesus (PBUH) in the Quran, are now something to be fought and discredited!

Normally we would display the truth of the event and prove as usual that the disagreement of the author with the Word of God in the Quran is his own making, yet, this time we will not show why a miracle of Jesus (PBUH) is also mentioned in the author's "Infancy Arabic

[illegible], but we will come to [illegible] in order to see what it [illegible] to our God — the source, Creator and Sustainer of [illegible].

[illegible] Read what Jesus said first when he talked in the words "I am the servant of Allah", [illegible] [illegible] What he [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

until the morning. If he heard a call to prayer he held back; if he did not hear it, he attacked. We came to Khaybar by night and the apostle passed the night there; and when morning came he did not hear the call to prayer, so he rode and we road with him . . . we met the workers of Khaybar coming out in the morning with their spades and baskets. When they saw the apostle and the army, they cried "Muhammad with his force" and turned tale and fled. The apostle said, "Allah Akbar! Khaybar is destroyed." "

Did the author mention anything about how fortified and strong Khaybar was? No.
Please pay attention to the fact that not only in actuality, Muhammad (PBUH) did not destroy Khaybar whatsoever, but also he never had the intention to do so. The outcome of the entire battle, which was the surrender conditions that he mandated, shows exactly what he intended by laying siege around Khaybar, which was nothing but to force them into a peaceful agreement by which they would not plot, attack, or impose danger against the Muslims in the future.

The author also, I believe, chose in his narrative to ignore the Muslim rule of engagement in battles ordered by Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) not to attack towns at night when the Prophet said:

"Leave in the name of Allah and by the religion of the Messenger of Allah, do not kill an old man, an infant, a child or a woman, and do not be excessive, pull your winnings together, be virtuous and good-doers for Allah loves the good-doers." (Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
*Narrator: Anas ibn Malik. **Reference**: Takhreej Mishkah Almasabeeh **Number**: 60/4. **Degree**: Good*

The author in many places in his book claimed to only have known the specific intentions and the thoughts of the inner mind of the Prophet, yet he would never mention a statement of civility about not killing women and children, even though he's narrating the exact same event. The reader might have also noticed that it is:

"one Muslim who remembered" who also doesn't have a name or reference. On the same page, the author follows by:
"The Muslim advance was inexorable." "The apostle, "according to Ibn Ishaq," seized the property piece by piece and conquered the forts one by one as he came to them."

*We will not comment again on why the author quotes only Ibn Ishaq. The amazing thing in here is that the author totally skipped Khaybar summoning the army of Ghatfan to fight Muhammad (PBUH), fifteen days of siege, all the way to the point when the forts as he said, started to fall one after the other. Not to mention that he never said anything about the existence of forts in that peaceful garden of the farmers carrying their morning mist baskets!
You can see clearly the false image of the innocent farmers being attacked suddenly by the Muslims. Yet the author, even in his own words, did not explain to us what kind of gardens of innocence are these that have one fort to begin with, never mind what he just told us, that they were many, one after the other or the days and weeks needed to go through them!

How truthful is the narration of the author when the Muslims laid siege, offered Islam and absolute equal rights to their opponents first and then asked for certain conditions by which the peaceful coexistence can happen before they attempt the battle and before any fighting, even if a siege would last weeks in a harsh desert and limited supplies for the Muslim army versus a well-supplied opponent in his own territory behind forts that spanned one after the other!?

A major fabrication followed, when the author claims that after Fajr prayer, the Muslims attacked and entered Khaybar. I do not know why the author made such a fabrication. Was it to associate Muslim prayers with attacking opponents in a battle? Or was it to give an impression that the Muslims never laid siege for 15 days, never offered terms, that the whole battle may have only lasted that one day, and that Khaybar just fell with its eight forts and 10 thousand fighters after just

one morning of fighting?! Only Mr. Spencer knows what he is "narrating" to his readers!

What actually had happened is that after many days of siege and individual duels between some of the leading Muslim fighters and their counterparts from Khaybar who left their forts to challenge in the duels, the first three forts fell down in the hands of the Muslims.

So there were still five more forts that the Muslims had to go through to get into Khaybar itself. The leaders of Khaybar, however, had already made another massive strategic mistake.

They stored their new, state-of-the-art weapon then, the Catapult, in the first three forts, by which Muhammad (PBUH) could have filled them with burning tar and slammed the flames onto the rest of the forts and onto Khaybar itself. So what would the "Wrath of Muhammad" and the "destroyer of Khaybar" do?

Again, the goal for Muhammad (PBUH) was to force the people of Khaybar into peace. So he ordered his men to move the Catapult around to visible places so the warriors of Khaybar would see from their fortified positions, that Muhammad (PBUH) now has the capability of easily destroying Khaybar. Yet, Muhammad (PBUH) did not use any Catapult even once.

Muhammad (PBUH)'s plan worked when the leader of Khaybar offered him to surrender and accept peace, which Muhammad (PBUH) replied by his agreement but under his conditions. When Muhammad (PBUH) had control of Khaybar and when Khaybar surrendered to him, he was five forts away from Khaybar itself.

Now what did our author say about this?

On pages 139 and 140, the author wrote:

"Muhammad and his men offered the Fajr prayer, the Islamic dawn prayer, before it was light, and then entered Khaybar itself. The Muslims immediately set out to locate the inhabitants' wealth."! No Duels, no siege, no forts, just a walk in the park looking for wealth!

*Both parties agreed that half of the harvest of Khaybar would go to the Muslims, Khaybar would be a part of the Muslim state and the Muslim army would be responsible for the safety of the people of Khaybar after Khaybar is disarmed, and that its leader would pledge not to plot against the Muslim state.

Our author then brings a total abhorring fabrication by claiming that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) ordered the torture of the leader of Khaybar Kinana Ibn Al-Rabi who supposedly, according to the author's claim, had knowledge of Banu Nadir's treasure that was only entrusted with him!!

At the time, not only that Banu Nadir's leader Ibn Akhtab was alive and well in Khaybar, but that treasure and any other treasure Banu Nadir might have had, the Muslims themselves allowed Banu Nadir to carry out with them when they forced them into exile from Medina. But I guess the image and the smoky façade that the author is putting before the eyes of the American reader mandates a lost treasure and crazy pirates who would torture anyone to get to the buried golden coins!

The author makes a worse fabrication by claiming that the people of Khaybar were sent into exile, which is not true as we have mentioned. He added that only a small part of the Khaybar population that were farmers were allowed to stay for giving half of their crop to the Muslim state. The rest of Khaybar, which was the majority according to the author - even though they didn't break any covenant or tried to kill the Prophet himself like Banu Nadir or Banu Qaynuqa who were allowed to leave with all their possessions - our author claims that the majority of the people of Khaybar were allowed to leave just by leaving their gold and silver behind! The author heightened the fabrication by claiming that another lost treasure was found, and for that, Muhammad (PBUH) killed some of the men of Khaybar and enslaved their women and children, which is also not true.

The author never explained to us why the claimed majority of the people of Khaybar, which was basically a huge palm tree farm, were not given the treatment that Banu Nadir got, who posed more danger and tried to

assassinate the Prophet himself. The author also does not explain why the town that he himself called "oasis of Khaybar", all of a sudden held a minority of farmers and a majority of gold and silver horders who surrendered, reaching a peace covenant with the Prophet, yet all of a sudden there are buried treasures, killed men, enslaved women and children, more than what is in a third-class pirates movie?
It is just sad how much misinformation is imposed on a reader in just one single book!

"The poisoning of Muhammad"

Zaynab Bint Al-Harith was a Jewish woman from Khaybar who poisoned a sheep shoulder, and presented it as a gift to the Prophet, who ate from it, as did a companion by the name of Bashar Ibn Baraa.

The Prophet spat the meat and declared that the bones of the sheep had told him it was poisoned. When the woman was brought in, she said that members of her family were killed in the battle of Khaybar and if the Prophet was a king (a Prophet) he would have died and if he was a Prophet he would have been told it was poisoned.
As usual, Mr. Spencer has supernatural proprietary knowledge of the intentions and the inner thoughts of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) when he wrote:
"Because she had thus obliquely confessed his Prophet-hood,
Muhammad spared her life"
There is no reference whatsoever that the Prophet ever indicated or expressed this thought; obviously it is Mr. Spencer's usual attempt to empty the Prophet's forgiveness from its nobility by implying naively that it was for vanity! The Prophet of God, who made sure to eat sitting on the floor like servants, called himself, "I am but a servant of Allah", and ordered his companions to never stand up for him when he walks in, said:

"No one will enter Paradise if he had one iota of arrogance in his heart") Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abdu Allah Ibn Masoud. Reference: Saheeh Muslim, Number: 91. Degree: Correct

As per Mr. Spencer, this is someone who will forgive an assassin only because she hinted that he might be a Prophet!

But then what happened to Zaynab? There are two conflicting stories; one that she was forgiven by the Prophet and the other that she was executed. Which one is true? In my humble opinion, and that of some scholars, both are true. The Prophet had forgiven her initially, but after his companion died shortly of her poison, then according to the law of God she would have to be prosecuted for the man she murdered in cold blood, and she was then executed.

The author brings another weird story about gathering Jewish leaders around the poisoned sheep and asking them about right and wrong and hell fire!! Then, asking them about if the sheep was poisoned, with no verification of any source worth mentioning. I have more respect for the reader's time and mine to even comment on that.

"The spoils of Khaybar"

Saffyah Bint Al Akhtab was the daughter of the leader of Banu al Nadir and was captivated in the battle of Khaybar when one Muslim soldier chose her for marriage or to carry her responsibility. When she objected as a first lady of the tribe to be matched with an average soldier, another companion reported the incident to the Prophet, who agreed to marry her after she accepted Islam. Later she told the Prophet that she had a dream that the moon fell into her lap and that her father interpreted that with slapping her on the face for dreaming of marrying Muhammad. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) didn't marry her immediately but waited till after her next monthly period occurred, to consummate the marriage.
On page 142 the author narrates the same story but from the angle that the companion, who told the Prophet, didn't tell the Prophet about her

refusal to marry an average soldier but that:
"We have not seen the like of her among the captives of the war"
And as per the relentless demonizing machine of the author, the Prophet ran after the lust - God forbid - and:
"Muhammad then immediately freed her and married her himself"!

Even though it was stated that the Prophet didn't consummate the marriage till she had her period, listen to the absurdity of a fabrication, on page 143 the author wrote:
"Saffiya's feelings on going from a wife of a Jewish chieftain, to widow, to captive, to wife of the Prophet of Islam in the course of a single day are not recorded"

Unless a woman can have her monthly period come and go in the same day, then of course this fabrication will never be recorded!

"Prophet Muhammad is not the greatest man that ever lived because he was the most merciful, gentle and righteous. Prophet Muhammad is not the greatest man that ever lived because he was the most powerful in fighting oppression. Prophet Muhammad is the greatest man that ever lived because he was simultaneously both"

Moustafa Zayed

Chapter Nine

"The conquest of Mecca"

Mecca was Muhammad (PBUH)'s hometown in which he was born and lived, till he had to flee for his life to Medina. Mecca was also where he and his early companions were persecuted, boycotted, starved, tortured, and many of them were killed. The surrender of Mecca to the Muslims was a significant mark in the history of Islam.

When Mecca and its infidels surrendered without a fight to the Muslims and the Prophet of God:
Did the Prophet of God have every right to bring the killers of his companions, prosecute them in a fair trial and execute them for their crimes? Yes he did.
Did he have every right to take back all the properties and impose payments to his companions for their properties seized by the infidels of Quraysh? Yes he did.
Did he have every right to execute the leaders of the tribes who sent their men to kill the Prophet in his own bed before he fled to Medina? Yes he did.
And when we say did he have the right, we have to understand that we're not talking about some individual who belonged to a victorious society, trying to get justice against leaders of the defeated side. It was the right of the last Prophet of God against the most evil, vicious infidels responsible of the abhorring crimes tyrannically committed against him and some of the best of his companions.

It was Muhammad (PBUH) and his Muslims, with all the horrific memories of which most had power, and ability to rightly avenge themselves against the infidels of Quraysh.

How would the "founder of the world's most intolerant religion" - as per Mr. Spencer - avenge himself and the victims amongst some of the best of believers of God?
Here is what the last Prophet of God did:
Muhammad (PBUH), with his army, came into the center of Mecca, where Quraysh's leaders were gathered awaiting a fate they knew was bleak at best.
The Prophet asked them: "**What do you expect me to do to you?**" Some of them replied: "You are a noble brother and son of a noble brother."
The Prophet replied, "**Go, for you are set free**"

Again, "founder of the world's most intolerant religion" had given amnesty to every single soul in Mecca, including the leaders who harmed him personally and conspired relentlessly to kill him.
That blanket forgiveness even included the hired assassin who killed the Prophet's beloved uncle and great companion, Hamza Ibn Abdel Motaleb. Even "Wahshy" the assassin was given amnesty and forgiven!

Has this ever happened in the history of mankind before or after?

A Prophet of God, a military leader, whom he himself was persecuted, harmed, battled and attempts to end his own life were committed by the worst of infidels; pagans who were then all under his thumb, yet he let them all go, forgiven?

That same Prophet of God, is the same one that our truth-seeker is calling the "founder of the world's most intolerant religion"?
And as absurd and laughable statement as this could be, I want the reader to look even further into the almost perfect discipline, that the manners of the religion of Islam afforded the soldier of the army of ten thousand Muslim men. Men who have seen horrors for years, living under the horrible oppression of the same infidels who were at that moment inches away from the tips of their swords, yet they adhered to the decision of the Prophet of God, obeyed the orders of God, and did not avenge the crimes committed against them.

What is of the most importance to note is that these warriors are the collective human examples of Islamic manners to all Muslims throughout time and to date. These are the highest and noblest examples of a Muslim making "Jihad" or "striving" for the sake of God in the form of battling for God's cause when battling is a must for the nation.
Did the author enlighten his readers with that test of all litmus tests; about what Muslims are about?
Even though it was one of the brightest moments of human history, and evidence of the Prophet's absolute mercy, forgiveness, and pardoning the worst of criminals, it still should not be a surprise to the reader. For even Mr. Spencer himself had to show in a previous chapter - to our surprise - how Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) asked and prayed to Allah to forgive the leader of the hypocrites Ibn Salool. The Prophet visited him when he was sick, wished him well, performed the burial prayers upon his body, wrapped him in the Prophet's own shirt, carried him and laid him inside the grave himself.
That was the same Ibn Salool that provoked Banu Nadir to get into war against Muhammad (PBUH) after they broke their covenant, promising them two thousand soldiers that never arrived when the battle started, and was the same man that propagated the "Ifk" (fabrication) incident against Muhammad (PBUH)'s own wife; her honor and the Prophet's.

Not even the biggest of liars could come up with a claim that there was any hint of just one battle of resistance the Muslims had to go through to seize Mecca. Not even a two man duel.

And not even the "truth-seekers" of their time, could have fabricated stories about any killed by the Muslim army at the surrender of Mecca, any executed Quraysh leaders, warriors, any men, women, or even one soul.
Now, can Mr. Spencer, with a straight face, tell you the truth that is as glaring as the sun of probably one of the most significant events of forgiveness and mercy in human history?

Why would our truth-seeker then, narrate the event by giving it the title "The Conquest of Mecca", even though not one Muslim sword needed to be raised?
Can the author go against his self-imposed "narrative" and say the words "the Prophet forgave them all" or "the Prophet totally tolerated their abhorring crimes and set them and their families free"?
The author instead exhausts his readers about trivial individual stories that are irrelevant to the historically monumental pardoning of every Meccan.

On page 145, the author dances away from the blanket amnesty by either claiming things that never happened or, as usual, relying on another fabricated story of - you guessed it - Ibn Ishaq!
In probably one of the most, if not the most, significant events in the history of Islam and the Prophet, our author shows you the quality of his narrative by not quoting the micro-detailed events of the surrender of Quraysh within the leading Seerah references of Al-Bukhary, Muslim, Imam Ahmed, Al-Tarmazy, Ibn Majah, Al-Nasaey, Al-Tabary, or Ibn Katheer. He instead quotes a known fabricated story from Ibn Ishaq:
That Muhammad (PBUH) had forced Abu Sufyan, the leader of Quraysh, to become a Muslim under the threat of the sword, or he would have his head chopped off! Let's resort to logic here:
Why not kill Abu Sufyan, the leader of the infidels, who waged war against you, in Badr, in Uhud, and in the battle of the Trench? Why not kill him when you are more than justified to?
What benefit would the Prophet gain of him becoming a Muslim, knowing that according to Islamic law, if he declared Islam, he would have exactly the same rights that the companions of the Prophet had, and that he would get to keep all his properties, wealth, and walk free, not harmed and not losing one penny's worth of his wealth?
For the record, Abu Sufyan later turned to be one of the most sincere and respected companions of the Prophet himself.
On page 147 the author wrote:
"One of Muhammad's lieutenants, Abbas, responded to Abu Sufyan:

"Submit and testify that there is no God but Allah and that Muhammad is the apostle of God before you lose your head." Abu Sufyan complied."!

Only two possibilities here: Either the nonsense of the author claiming that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is an intolerant, booty-seeking, blood-thirsty violent man is rubbish! Or the story is what it is, another one of his total fabrications!

On page 145, the author starts by omitting that there was almost two years between the battle of Khaybar and the opening of Mecca to Muslims, and tries to make it look like a grand surprise to Quraysh!
After Khaybar, Quraysh became the imminent Muslims destination, a given that was developing day by day in broad daylight, for two years. During these two years, Quraysh saw the number of people accepting Islam exponentially growing four-folds before their eyes, and with it, the size of the army of the Muslims reaching ten thousands from about only 1500 at the battle of Khaybar.
The real surprise would have been that the Muslims would not go back and take over the homeland of the Prophet, and not otherwise.
On page 145, the author writes:
"The surprise was almost given away by a Muslim who sent a letter to the Quraysh informing them of Muhammad (PBUH)'s plans; however the Muslims intercepted the letter."

The author then brings a translation of what he claimed was a translation of verses 1-4 of chapter 60 of Surat (Al-Mumtahina) yet he only translated verses 2-4 and omitted from his translation verse no. 1! Why?
He claimed that these verses were revealed about the person who sent that letter that was supposedly breaking the "surprising" news that every man knew for years, yet verse 1 that he omitted tells of the occasion and the true context of the verses revelation which is general to all Muslims of all time; that is not to show kindness to those who fought Muslims and exiled them out of their own homes.

The first verse (omitted by the author) says:

"O, you who believe! Do not take my enemy or your enemy as an ally. You give them your kindness and they have disbelieved in what you were given of the truth, they exiled you from your homes because you believe in Allah your God, if you have left to strive for My Sake and hoping for satisfying me, then don't show them kindness and I am more knowledgeable of what you hid and what you displayed. And whoever does that amongst you, then he went astray of the straight path."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Mumtahina) Ch (60) Verse (1)

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا عَدُوِّي وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ تُلْقُونَ إِلَيْهِمْ بِالْمَوَدَّةِ وَقَدْ كَفَرُوا بِمَا جَاءَكُمْ مِنَ الْحَقِّ يُخْرِجُونَ الرَّسُولَ وَإِيَّاكُمْ ۙ أَنْ تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ رَبِّكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ خَرَجْتُمْ جِهَادًا فِي سَبِيلِي وَابْتِغَاءَ مَرْضَاتِي ۚ تُسِرُّونَ إِلَيْهِمْ بِالْمَوَدَّةِ وَأَنَا أَعْلَمُ بِمَا أَخْفَيْتُمْ وَمَا أَعْلَنْتُمْ ۚ وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْهُ مِنْكُمْ فَقَدْ ضَلَّ سَوَاءَ السَّبِيلِ (1)

On page 146, the author pre-empts the amnesty that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had given to every single soul in Mecca by claiming:
"Many of the most notable Quraysh warriors now deserted and, converting to Islam, joined Muhammad's forces."

The author apparently confuses you between the exponential growth rate of men and women accepting Islam in Quraysh and more so in Medina, with a notion that during the night in which the Muslims camped out of Mecca, that many of the most notable leaders of Quraysh accepted Islam, converted and deserted to the Muslim army, before the morning had come!
So they converted, deserted Mecca and joined the Muslim army overnight, and were not forgiven as infidels when Mecca surrendered to the Muslims hours later!

And as illogical and unbelievable that is, apparently it could be nothing but an attempt to minimize the number of nobles that did not accept Islam, that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had shown his mercy, tolerance, and unparalleled leniency, not only upon them, but to the entire population of the infidels of Quraysh.

"Apostates to be killed"

The author starts this paragraph by another fabrication. He wrote: "When Muhammad (PBUH) "forced his entry" into Mecca according to Ibn Saad, "the people embraced Islam willingly or unwillingly." "!

Another trick used on the reader, who's not paying attention, where in the middle of the sentence the author said "according to Ibn Saad" and then quotes Ibn Saad, by which he confuses the reader as if the first part of the sentence was also a quotation of Ibn Saad (who is a military defector of all people to be quoted). In this case, the author also puts emphasis on "forced his entry," by putting quotation marks around it.

Where is it stated, even in one of the corrupt fabricated stories found in Ibn Ishaq's or any other reference, that there was any resistance even symbolized by one man raising one sword against the army of Muhammad (PBUH)? None.

Were there any force ever needed to enter Mecca? None.

But in the B movie of Spencer studios, Muhammad has to be a villain forcing his sword into anything, everywhere!

And that was why the author had to impose that sentence to begin with when narrating the Prophet entering a town that surrendered unconditionally before the Prophet had even entered.

The narrative of Mr. Spencer, as you know by now, is always crazy-jihadist-warriors with unheard-of violence, lusting for women and buried treasures, chopping off heads for entertainment, yet even in the moment that showed the highest amount of forgiveness, self-control, mercy and tolerance in the history of mankind, Mr. Spencer can only claim a quote of Ibn Saad, that people embraced Islam "willingly or unwillingly"; a

claim that is against everything Islamic history stood for during 1400 years. Here are the orders of God:

"There is no compulsion in religion"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch.(2) Verse (256), and the verse,

لَا إِكْرَاهَ فِي الدِّينِ (256)

"Guiding them is not up to you, but it is Allah who guides whomever He wills"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch. (2) Verse (272)

لَيْسَ عَلَيْكَ هُدَاهُمْ وَلَٰكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ ۗ (272)

But according to Mr. Spencer Muslims that day weren't following either the orders of God or his Prophet, but following the predetermined script of Mr. Spencer!

I ask the reader not only how the author, defector Ibn Saad, or any human being for that matter, knew what was in the hearts of people who accepted Islam at the time? And before we answer that question, I would ask the author and all his fabricated stories:

Did every single infidel or pagan in Quraysh accept Islam after the Muslims seized Mecca? The answer is such that even the author himself has to admit: No.

Did all Christians and Jews in the Arab Peninsula convert "willingly or unwillingly" to Islam when Mecca surrendered to the Muslims? Even the author himself has to admit: No.

What's a well-known historical fact is that, whoever did not want to accept Islam did not have to explain why, and did not have to apologize; he only had to declare it, just so that he would not be allowed to join the Muslim army as a Muslim. And by declaring that, he also had to contribute to the community his share of tax (Jizyah), of which we have explained its rules sufficiently in previous chapters.

For his claim to be even something that is worth a paragraph in anyone's book, our author would have to show us the thousands of pagans, atheists, Christians and Jews that were mass-murdered in Mr. Spencer's "crazy-Muslim land" to show us how that at that point everyone in Mecca became Muslim" willingly or unwillingly"!!

The author then offends our intelligence - again - by bringing the issue of apostates.

Muhammad (PBUH) and all the Muslims were at war with Quraysh, till the day he seized Mecca and gave them all amnesty.

In a state of war, and I remind the reader that at the early stages of that war, when the Muslim army was at times not even one-fifth the army that Quraysh summoned, it was not a war to force surrender or to gain more land. It was a war to the annihilation of Muhammad (PBUH), the Muslims, and Islam altogether. During that state of war, when you not only convert back to paganism, but associate that with defecting to the enemy of Muslims itself, then that is military treason in capital letters, which is punishable in any court, in any country, in any time death by a firing squad. If it was just espionage without declaring your defection, it would have been a life-sentence at best.

The author narrates for us the story of Abdullah Ibn Saad, who defected from the Muslim army to that of Quraysh, converting back to paganism. Before we narrate the incident - Abdullah ibn Saad, meeting with Muhammad (PBUH), when Muhammad (PBUH) settled as the ruler of Mecca - to decide his fate after his treason, I want to ask the reader to join me in asking Mr. Spencer, how is it that he skipped telling his readers as to how Muhammad (PBUH) entered Mecca and what had he done to his and the Muslims' worst enemies, persecutors, torturers, and the killers of his best companions?

How is it possible that Mr. Robert Spencer - who is to enlighten us about the truth of Muhammad - intentionally doesn't say a word about the most important event of the history of Muhammad (PBUH) and Islam itself, at least so far in his chapter about "the conquest of Mecca"?

Was the fact that they were given all amnesty by the last Prophet of God, the reason why Mr. Spencer skipped everything to address first the case of two traitors who defected to Quraysh's army?!

But more interestingly; even the incident Mr. Spencer resorted to, showed - again - the mercy and forgiveness of the Prophet and the optimum civility of the law of God!

What was the judgment of the Prophet of Islam upon a military defecting traitor, who Mr. Spencer highlighted his story as 'an apostate to be killed"?

The last Prophet of God let him and his brother walk free!

Abdullah Ibn Saad pled for his life and recited the certification indicating that he became a Muslim again. In any court of law, or wherever Mr. Spencer resides nowadays, that certification of allegiance to the same Islamic constitution that Ibn Saad had already betrayed defecting to its worst enemies, would have been worthless and a nonevent to his punishment. The Prophet turned his head away when Ibn Saad recited the certification for the first time, and the second time. But when Ibn Saad repeated it for a third time, Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) set him and his own brother free!

Applying the cardinal Islamic rule, that even the Prophet himself has no right to judge what is truly in people's hearts, and since there weren't any apparent crimes against Muslims or victims of the two brothers during the time of their defection to Quraysh's army, the Prophet would have not judged whether their repentance or their certification of Islam is true in their hearts or not. They were set free.

"Arabic Story of Abdullah Ibn Saad"

Our author, who totally omitted the Prophet forgiving all infidels of Mecca and giving them a pardon, comments on the release of the Ibn Saad brothers by saying, on page 147:

"Apostasy from Islam has always been for Muhammad a supreme evil."

Maybe defecting to the enemy's army in a state of war, which is punishable by death in every country in the history of the world that we're aware of, should, according to the author for some reason, be equivalent to only naughty-child play in Islam, so based on that assumption, he apparently blames Muhammad (PBUH)'s perception of military treason as a "supreme evil"!

I also want to remind the readers of the title Mr. Spencer chose for the Ibn Saad's subsection, "**Apostates to be killed**"!
Were they killed? No. Would the title be "Apostates pardoned" or "Apostates forgiven or released"? Absolutely not. This truth doesn't fit Mr. Spencer's narrative!

Still, and up till this point in the chapter, Prophet Muhammad's forgiveness upon the entire population of the largest city in the Arab Peninsula is totally trivialized and skipped out of the "Conquest of Mecca"!
Instead, the author brings a story about defectors of the Muslim army, which we have explained, several times so far, that at that time officially declaring your apostasy - when no one forced you to declare what your heart's belief was - was an immediate act of confessed treason that was punishable by death, not only in the land of Islam but in any country at that time in history.

On page 148, the author narrates another story about another defection, and adds some of his own brand of spices. The story was about some Bedouin herders who claimed they accepted Islam and received support from the Muslims. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) gave them permission to go to where the herd of charity camels were, and benefit from their milks. In rewarding the generosity of Islam and the help they received from the Muslims, as soon as the herders got away from Medina, they killed the camel shepherds, mutilated their eyes, stole the camels and renounced Islam in public. What is the punishment of premeditated murder and armed robbery coupled with defection or treason in any court of law nowadays?

If capital punishment wasn't to be specifically mandated for that kind of crime in any era worldwide, then for what other crime?
That kind of theft, treason, and murdering of innocent souls in cold blood fits into the crime of corruption in Earth, and not as the author translates it "in the land". Notice how the author claimed that the defectors released the camels to the desert after defecting so the theft crime would be taken out of the equation, which is not true, not to mention that even though there was absolutely no reason to kill the shepherds unless they of course wanted to keep the loot of the camels after their defection; defection, we might add, coupled with murder and theft, which are corruption on Earth crimes in capital letters.
Did anyone in the history of Islam call that crime anything but corruption in earth? No.
Did the Prophet call it anything different? No
And what does our author, on his own, call it for us after 1400 years of Islamic history? Apostasy!
The punishment in Islam is severe for the crime of corruption in Earth, yet at the end, it's not one iota more severe than the punishment of this crime in any country or any military, which is death. The punishment in Islam for corrupters in Earth is that an arm and a leg are cut diagonally, leaving them to die, in public, for everyone to be deterred from doing such robbery-murders in the future.
Such punishment in Islam is the same punishment for none other than the crime of terrorism which is a major corruption in earth crime.
What is more interesting is that the author chose to speak about the severe punishment with a bias to camel thieves, herders killers and not the main crime of terrorizing and killing the innocent herders, even when it fitted his most favorite subject of terrorism.
The spin that our author added is on page 148, when he wrote: "And their eyes put out with heated iron bars and that they are left in the desert to die. Their pleas for water, he ordered, must be refused."

*Which is an exception to the default punishment of that crime in Islam; because the killers did the same to the eyes of the herders they killed.

On page 148, our author also wrote:
"Muhammad legislated for his community that no Muslim could be put to death except for murder, unlawful sexual intercourse, and apostasy. He said flatly: "Whoever changed his Islamic religion, then kill him." "

*As usual, it's always the corrupted information that the author selects. First, not every unlawful sexual intercourse is punishable by death, only if the sinner is married.
Secondly, the quotation where the Prophet said to apply the death punishment on defectors was in his correct quotation:
"Whoever changed his religion, then kill him."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
*Narrator: Abdu Allah Ibn Abbas. **Reference**: Saheeh Al Buckhary, **Number**: 6922. **Degree**: Correct*

The author added the word "Islamic" on his own before the word religion. And while we know that the religion that the Prophet mentioned is none other than Islam, yet the clear difference between writing the history on the case of certain orientalists and Islam-bashers like Mr. Spencer, in comparison to the ethics of verifying historical events by Muslim scholars, are sometimes vast enough that when adding one letter or one word that was not there, it will discredit the entire story by any Muslim scholar, and sometimes any narration of the teller all together.

What is really interesting is that our "truth-seeker" of all people, writes at the bottom of the page:
"Unfortunately, this claim simply does not accord with the facts of Muhammad's life. That such assertions pass unchallenged only underscores the need for westerns to become informed about the actual words and deeds of Muhammad - which make the actions of Islamic state much more intelligible than do the words of Islamic apologists in the west."

*Well, I can see it as if it's happening right now, that Mr. Spencer will call me an apologist! Let me ask the reader:

Did the so called Muslim apologists, who were hand-picked by Mr. Spencer, the ones that committed the action of fabrication, omitting part or whole verses of the Holy Quran, with misinformation and intentional mistranslation for a living hundreds of times, like an author that we all know? Who should be the apologist then?

The author made that statement as an answer to an American Muslim who stated that:
"There is no historical record, which indicates that Muhammad or any of his companions ever sentenced anyone to death for Apostasy."

*And while that statement is true, the author apparently intentionally confuses the generality of the meaning of apostasy with the specific crime of defecting to the enemy's army in a state of war.
Defection to the army of your worst enemy of Quraysh at that time could not just be minimized into apostasy or the one aspect of changing one's religion or belief. Changing your religion itself is impossible to prosecute according to Islamic law, unless you go ahead and stick your head inside the cannon of the law by declaring your conversion, butting heads with the Muslim state in contempt, to challenge and offend the constitution of the land, even though it is unlawful for anyone to ask you to declare what's in your heart!

What religion is that, that mandates its followers to plead to TV stations or walk around knocking on everyone's door declaring that you have converted to a new religion? This is a totally different issue than the issue of freedom of religion; in our case it is simply and clearly the question of what level of dissidence is allowed in a state of war.
The author brings the story of a Christian Pakistani who could have worshipped quietly in his heart or in Churches - that by the way had existed in Muslim lands since the first day of Muhammad (PBUH)'s Prophet-hood - and lived his life following whatever doctrine he could choose. Yet, some in the West get fascinated by whoever tries to offend Muslims in their homelands and offend their constitution publicly. That's

actually how we learned about the name of the man in America to begin with.
The most important aspect of apostasy and it is a rule in Islam, that is so well-declared by Islam and the Muslims to everyone, is the punishment for apostasy itself. So, as a new member who is thinking about accepting Islam, why would I take the chance and become a Muslim for if I wanted to change my mind later, I might be subject to be killed; why become a Muslim altogether? Correct? To the contrary, Islam is the fastest growing religion, not only in every corner in the world, but even in America.
In the recent statistic that was announced by CNN in 2009, it is stated that from the year 1990 to the year 2008, which is a span of 18 years, no religion, denomination, or faction of the major religions in America had percentage growth over the other groups in the statistic, except for one religion. That religion growth, compared to the other groups, was not the surprise; the most shocking result was that Islam was not only the only growing religion in America - which suffered two significant terrorist attacks that the media and the likes of Mr. Spencer tried to stamp on the forehead of Islam as a religion - the American Muslim population did not just grow, but actually doubled!

Does the author think that he's breaking news to us about the Hadeeth of the Prophet regarding the punishment of defection to the enemy's army, according to Islamic Law?
Does the author think that American Muslims who chose based on the correct knowledge of the religion of Islam itself, have just abandoned their jobs, their homes and ran to the hills to prepare for the clear and present danger of the apostasy rule in Islam, based on Mr. Spencer's breaking news?

It is a well-known rule, yet Islam is embraced and accepted on the face of the planet by tens of thousands, every single day.

"Muhammad at the Kabaa"

Another corrupted story: Muhammad (PBUH) stood before the Kabaa and recited the verse of the Holy Quran that stated that the right of Allah upon all people is there to proclaim above all, and that falsehood is bound to vanish. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had ordered all the statues of all the idols to be knocked down and destroyed, and some of the paintings that the pagans also worshipped. What did not happen was what the author claimed on page 149, when he said:
"He ordered that all the idols be burned except for an icon of Jesus and Mary."

Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) ordered every single item, painting, and statue, depiction of any idol, character, Prophet or angel to be destroyed.
As a Muslim American scholar, and while I am well-aware of the reverence that Islam and the Holy Quran have for Jesus as a mighty Prophet of God, and for Virgin Mary as the greatest woman that ever lived and will ever live, I cannot stay silent to what the author tried to erroneously add to a historical fact. Not only that even the depiction of Jesus (PBUH) and Virgin Mary in any form is forbidden in Islam, but Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) himself forbade totally any depiction of himself, whether a picture or a statue be allowed; him and any other Prophet.
In Islam, it is the message and the mannerism of the Prophets to be followed, not what they look like, especially when history is the witness of how extreme people may take the reverence of Prophets to the limit of the unforgivable sin of worshipping them, either alongside God, or worse, depicting them as God Himself.

Finally, the author admits the tolerance, forgiveness, and mercy of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) upon the leaders of Quraysh, when he narrated what we narrated in the beginning of the chapter; on page 149 he wrote the reply of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)'s question to them:

""Oh Quraysh, what do you think that I am about to do with you?" They answered, "You are a noble brother, son of a noble brother." And it was so."

*And I would like to ask the author here, "And it was so" what?!
In the past four pages, the author gave us a splitting headache by analyzing apostasy, military defectors, a fabricated story about forcing Abu Sufyan to convert to Islam under the threat of a sword, and when the Prophet gives the entire population of Quraysh, including Abu Sufyan, a blanket amnesty and forgiveness, all that the author can enlighten us with about the "truth about Muhammad" is the lengthy statement of "And it was so"? Amazing!

Even on page 150, when the author narrated when Hind Bint Utba, the wife of Abu Sufyan - who hired Wahshy to kill Hamza, the uncle of the Prophet and mutilated his body - asked the Prophet to forgive her, which as you may expect by now, the Prophet did forgive her, our truth-seeker found no more than six words of extreme extrapolation of the tolerance of the Prophet to indicate that the Prophet did forgive the woman. The author wrote: "The homage of the women accepted,"!
The author then followed with Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)'s famous declaration of Mecca being a Muslim holy sanctuary forever, where no life should be taken: even trees couldn't be cut.
The same quotation of the Prophet is also one of the scientific miracles of Muhammad (PBUH)'s quotations when he clearly indicated the fact that trees have souls and responses to pleasure and pain; and in the case of cutting them down, extreme pain of the death of the tree, which scientists have proved 1400 years later.

"The battle of Hunayn and mastery of Arabia"

On page 150, the author wrote:
"Muhammad was the master of Mecca, but there was one additional great obstacle between him and mastery of all Arabia."

What the author is implying here is clear; it is that Muhammad's goal was to be "master of Mecca", and as we explained and displayed many factual events that showed that all the burden, struggle and difficulties Muhammad (PBUH) had faced when he was then over 60 years of age, were only to invite to and protect the path of God.
Muhammad (PBUH)'s biggest sacrifice was his own self being in the first line of war, fighting tyrants who oppressed people not to worship their own Creator.

The next battle of the Muslims was the battle of Hunayn, and before we get to the author's narration of the battle, I would like to bring an example of the kindness, generosity, and mercy of the Prophet in one related event, that is in my opinion, unparalleled in the history of mankind, where the Prophet's mercy and forgiveness were given to people who were not even born then!

The battle of Hunayn was with the people of the city of Ta'if, which is south of Mecca. Ten years earlier, the Prophet used to visit a tribe after the other, and invite them to the righteous path of their One Mighty Creator. When Muhammad (PBUH) invited them, he did not ask them to surrender their monies to him or force them to make him their mighty leader, on the contrary, he would ask them to accept the basic manners of Islam; the Oneness of God, doing well by parents, not to steal, kill, lie, or cheat. Many tribes and many members of many tribes accepted Islam on the spot. Yet when it came to the tribe of Thaqif of the city of Ta'if, they rejected the kindness and polite invitation of the Prophet so harshly and rudely that the Prophet walked, so saddened, a distance of more than ten miles till he started to gain consciousness of his surroundings again.
He reached a place called Qarn Al-Thaaleb at the time. In Sahih Al-Bukhari, it was narrated that the Thaqif tribe had hurt the Prophet so much that Arch-Angel Gabriel himself appeared to the Prophet and told him that God had ordered Gabriel to give the Prophet the choice that one

of the angels crush the entire tribe between two of Mecca's mountains just for what they have done to his Prophet.
The last Prophet of God answered:
"No, for Allah might bring out of their offspring someone who may worship God and not associate a partner with Him."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
*Narrator: Ayesha. **Reference**: Saheeh Al Buckhary, **Number**: 3231. **Degree**: Correct*

The Prophet forgave them, even though they hurt him enough to have the angels descend from heaven with a license to punish them: all just to have mercy on a possibility of the children of the infidels' children becoming worshippers.

In the battle of Hunayn itself, and contrary to the author's claim that he wrote on page 151:
"The Muslims, despite their superior numbers, were routed."

*Allah had revealed in the Holy Quran that the reason was not despite of their superior numbers, but actually the superior numbers of the Muslims at that battle fascinated them into complacency in the beginning, as the main reason for their retreat in the battle.
In the Holy Quran:

"Allah has truly given you victory on many battle fields, and on the Day of Hunain when you rejoiced at your great number, but it didn't avail you and the earth, as vast as it is, was tightened upon you, then you turned back in flight"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawba) Ch (9) Verse (25)

لَقَدْ نَصَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ فِي مَوَاطِنَ كَثِيرَةٍ ۙ وَيَوْمَ حُنَيْنٍ ۙ إِذْ أَعْجَبَتْكُمْ كَثْرَتُكُمْ فَلَمْ تُغْنِ عَنْكُمْ شَيْئًا وَضَاقَتْ عَلَيْكُمُ الْأَرْضُ بِمَا رَحُبَتْ ثُمَّ وَلَّيْتُمْ مُدْبِرِينَ (25)

As Allah had revealed in so many places in the Holy Quran, a severe punishment is given to people when they attribute the blessings that Allah had bestowed upon them only to themselves and not ultimately to

Allah as the Giver of all blessings. Worse, sometimes people are fascinated altogether with their own selves and what they have, forgetting - sometimes - Allah altogether.

Then the author - again - refrains from calling clear matters by their names, and calls the aid that Allah revealed had given the Muslims to reverse the tide of the battle to the Muslim's favor, by the word "supernatural help"!

The aid of God to His believers who are sacrificing everything they have, even their lives, for His sake, is not aid from God but "supernatural help."

The author displays his mastery again on page 152. The mastery of emptying great events in the life of the Prophet of their content, which are truly telling of the utmost quality of his manners and belittling them, or redirecting their moral into totally irrelevant issues that fits his narrative.

He narrates the famous incident when Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was distributing the spoils of the battle of Hunayn, when one Bedouin, who was new to Islam, objected rudely to the size of his share of the battle winnings. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had a very just system of distributing the spoils of war according to how bravely the man fought and how many times he had been fighting with the Muslim army. The Bedouin yelled at the Prophet saying "Oh Prophet of Allah, fear Allah". And the Prophet replied politely, by saying:

"Am I not the most deserving of the people of earth to be fearful of God?" (Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Saieed Al khodrey. Reference: Saheeh Muslim, Number: 1064. Degree: Correct

Mind you that this was not only the last Prophet of God, but the leader of a huge army being offended and accused by a soldier.

The companions of the Prophet jumped angrily in response to how offensive the Bedouin was with the Prophet of God. One of them was Khalid Ibn Al-Waleed, the great military leader who drew his sword, asking the Prophet for permission to kill the man. The Prophet answered with his known tolerance:
"Leave him. He might be a praying man." Khalid Ibn Al-Walid replied, "But how many praying men don't say with tongues what's in their hearts?" The Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) answered by his historical statement that not only became a cardinal rule in Islamic law, but actually one of the brightest moments of the history of civil rights of mankind:

"Allah did not send me to dig into people's hearts or split their insides open to see what's in them."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Saieed Al khodrey. Reference: Bayhaqy's Al sunan Al kubra, Number: 196/8. Degree: proven

The great meaning is that even the Prophet of God himself does not have the right to investigate people's intentions, or their inner beliefs under any circumstances, even in the case of an ignorant, rude Bedouin offending the Prophet of God himself.

How many times did orientalists and Islam-bashers like Mr. Spencer claim that - apart from all people - they were so "supernaturally" privy to the intentions, motivations, and inner-thoughts of Muslims and the Prophet of God himself?

On page 152, the author comments on the status of the last Prophet of God amongst Muslims, where he is the ultimate human example of righteousness and Islamic manners. He wrote:
"His words and deeds exemplify their highest pattern of conduct forming the only absolute standard within Islam: anything sanctioned by the example of the Prophet, with the sole exceptions of incidents such as that of the satanic verses, in which he was repentant, is good."

*The author uses what is known in the Arabic literature by the adage "mixing poison with honey," where he speaks about Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)'s great status amongst Muslims and laces the paragraph with the reference to the "satanic verses" fabrication. He even adds another fabrication of the Prophet repenting of the fabrication of the satanic verses incident that never happened to begin with. Not only did we totally refute the satanic verses fabrication of the author in a previous chapter, but we would reiterate that the satanic verses fabrication, and consequently the claimed repenting of the Prophet of it, are not mentioned whether separately or together in any reliable Islamic source by the quotations of the Prophet, or any verified historical account of Islam altogether. If the author is trying to impose the infamous propaganda technique of repeating the lie so many times till it's perceived as truth, we will refute it for the author as many times needed till he is perceived as what he truly is worth as a researcher.

"Invitation to Islam"

The author moves to the era when Islam started to spread outside the Arab Peninsula. And as we said before, the number one duty and obligation of a Prophet of God was none other than to spread the invitation to the religion of God to his people, and in the case of the last Prophet of God, to all mankind.
With every Godly message, every Prophet of God is mandated by God to demand virtue and prohibit vice to the utmost of his ability. In the Holy Quran:

"Those whom if we enabled them on the earth, they would establish prayers, give charity, demand virtue and prohibit vice, and to God all matters return"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Hajj) Ch (22) Verse (41)

الَّذِينَ إِنْ مَكَّنَّاهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ أَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ وَأَمَرُوا بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَنَهَوْا عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ ۗ وَلِلَّهِ عَاقِبَةُ الْأُمُورِ (41)

The author describes this obligation on page 152, he wrote:
"...becoming the ruler of all Arabia. He began to set his sights on even larger quarry, eyeing the adjacent Byzantine and Persian territories."

*Notice the language of the author describing Prophet Muhammad's task as if it is eyeing worldly prizes or some sort of potential business expansion opportunity!
As a matter of fact, the bravery of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) saying a word of truth to the leader of the largest and oldest empire in the world at the time, is another undeniable proof of the level of self-denying and sacrifice that the Prophet reached for the sake of God.
The Roman Empire spread throughout the three known continents in over 800 years. They had armies that can cover the entire Arab Peninsula and its entire population many times over.
The deceptive statement that Mr. Spencer inserted in the first sentence, becomes important here, on page 152 he wrote:
"The Prophet of Islam now faced little opposition,"

*What he meant was little opposition in the Arab Peninsula itself, but by any stretch of the imagination provoking the Roman empire, was creating a stand-off with the largest army and biggest Empire in the world, which is anything but "little" and much more perilous than just an "opposition".

On page 152, commenting Hercules refusing the invitation of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) to him and his people to accept Islam, the author wrote:
"Hercules did not accept Islam and soon the Byzantines would know well that the warriors of Jihad indeed granted no safety to those who made such a choice."

*Notice here that the Muslim army that controlled the entire Arab Peninsula is not an army in the eyes of Mr. Spencer, on the contrary they are some "warriors of Jihad" who are about to take on the largest

empire in the world. Of course the Roman army consists of soldiers and is an army, but a Muslim army, No way!

The author's notorious false claim that non-Muslims lived under Muslim rule in subjugating conditions, is proven even more false by the author's previous statement. Even according to his claim, a second-class citizen is still a citizen, is still alive and safe, otherwise there would be no second-class citizens! How is it then an issue of "safety" or "no safety" to those who made such a "choice"?!
And since I am getting tired of refuting the absolute falsehood of the author's narrative, let me ask the question: what did some of the world's most prominent thinkers say about the subject?

""But we haven't heard - under Islamic rule - about any attempt to force non-Muslim communities to accept Islam, or about any organized oppression to eradicate the Christian faith. If the Muslim Caliphs had chosen any of the above two plans they would have swept Christianity with the same ease that Ferdinand and Isabella swept the Islamic faith out of Spain, that which Louis XIV had made the protestant faith followers punishable in France, or the same ease that Jews were exiled out of England for 350 years"
John Taylor Caroline (1753-1824) the American political Philosopher (Republican Jeffersonian)

"The eastern churches in Asia were already separated from the rest of the Christian world which was not to support them in any way considering them heretics of the religion. Therefore the sheer existence of theses churches today is in itself a strong evidence of the general tolerance of Islamic governments towards them"
Sir Thomas Walker Arnold, the most prominent Orientalist in history

The invitation to Islam as we have mentioned earlier was one of three options, you accept Islam and you'd have every right Muslims have, or keep your religion, do not participate in the Muslim army that defends your home, but pay your due tax (Jizyah) like anyone else, or

fight in a battle man-to-man, face-to-face.
The third option however, in that specific case with the Romans was an apparent peril to the Muslims themselves.
The Muslims were surely to be annihilated, in comparison to the gigantic Roman Army and its available resources.
But to the last Prophet of Islam, and to his believers, inviting to the path of God was about fulfilling your duty to your Creator, no matter what the sacrifice was.
It was never about how big or how small the army they faced.
Another major factor is that all these battles with the Romans were about lands occupied by the European Romans, and not against the natives of these Asian or later African lands.
How long the Romans occupied and oppressed the locals had nothing to do with the fact that they were not Roman lands.
I also want to draw the reader's attention to the fact that Muhammad (PBUH) was over 60 years of age then, and had been fighting almost all the time with unbelievable odds against him: odds that any brave man would have not dared to take on.
That fact in itself answers the earlier claim of Mr. Spencer about the pleasures that God afforded His Prophet. At that moment, Muhammad (PBUH) was drawing the attention and was about to face the danger of taking on the largest empire in the world and its army.

On page 153, the author brings about one of the famous quotations of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), which showed one of the visions and miracles of the Prophet. In it, the Prophet predicted the fall of the two major world powers at the time, the Romans and the Persians.
A quotation, of an illiterate man with barely an army of 15 thousand predicted the fall of the two major powers that literally controlled the rest of the world and its armies.
The quotation, like the entire Prophet's, comes true in perfect detail.
Do they comment about that? Do they ask themselves how is this possible, and how could it have happened?
Even with some minimum objectivity, did they ask themselves; is there a possibility that this man is truly the last Prophet of God, after all his

unparalleled achievements, predictions, and miracles since the day he was revealed as the last Prophet of God?!

It always amazes me how much, and how many times that Islam-bashers themselves, bring to their readers the proofs of the Prophet-hood and the divine protection of God to his Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), yet they don't believe! In the Holy Quran:

"And they said our hearts are sealed, but Allah had cursed them for their infidelity that they rarely believe"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch (2) Verse (88)

وَقَالُوا قُلُوبُنَا غُلْفٌ ۚ بَل لَّعَنَهُمُ اللَّهُ بِكُفْرِهِمْ فَقَلِيلًا مَا يُؤْمِنُونَ (88)

The author further ignores the religious duties of the Prophet, and the obligations given to him by God to invite to His path, and conjures this ultimate duty into a town hall meeting resolution.
On page 153 he wrote:
"The Prophet of Islam codifies this expansionist imperative as one of the duties of his new community."

The author then brings one of his famous misleading and erroneous translations, which is the verse in the Holy Quran that says
(our translation):

"Fight those who do not believe in God or the Last Day, do not forbid what God and His Messenger had forbidden, nor accept the manners of the religion of the truth amongst those of the people of the Scriptures, till they give the Jizyah with willing submission."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) Ch (9) Verse (29)

قَاتِلُوا الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَلَا بِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَلَا يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ حَتَّىٰ يُعْطُوا الْجِزْيَةَ عَن يَدٍ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ (29)

I tried to find an excuse for the author, as to how could it be possible that he did not understand the simple verse of his own English translation. And I couldn't find an excuse.

The verse simply obligates the Prophet to collect the due taxes from non-Muslim citizens of the Muslim state, even if they were Christians and Jews (as the people of the scripture).
First, you cannot ignore, unless you intentionally want to mislead your reader, that the verse expresses that the people of the Scripture have a special treatment amongst all non-Muslims, and by that, when the verse mandated that the non-Muslims who have unethical behavior of doing what's forbidden or illegal, pay their taxes, it moved to the specificity of collecting the tax even from Christians and Jews.

What happens to an average fifth-generation all-American who's convicted of cheating the U.S government for taxes? Does the government empower itself with every right to search, arrest, and seize all properties of that person or not? Of course they do.
Does that make him a second class-discriminated and subjugated citizen?!
What would the case be - practically - for a minority who doesn't cheat on taxes but worse, actually, doesn't want to pay any tax at all?!
What the verse does really say in a most abbreviated sentence is simply this: "People who do not pay taxes should be forced to pay taxes"!

As a matter of fact, the investigation, arrest and the consequent resignation of the former governor of the state of New York Eliot Spitzer - after an escort-service scandal - was initiated with an excuse by the IRS monitoring some of the NY governor bank transactions!

And when the IRS catches the tax-cheater - in our case evader - do they bring him in jail by providing him with a nice tuxedo, or in shackles? Do they make sure if he is of any significance in society, to be brought in handcuffs out of the location they arrested him, parading him

before photographers and media cameras in "willing submission" or not? Of course they do.
Now, what would be the law for non-Muslims who not only do not believe in God to begin with and have the worst of manners as the verse stated, but who also refuse to pay their taxes at all?
Do they let them walk free without paying their fair share of taxes to their society? Or if they were of the people of the Scriptures, they should have an unheard-of privilege of living tax-free in their society?!
Mind you, that, as we explained the rule of the Jizyah before; it was 100 dollars worth per year per the able to fight non-Muslim man. This was a tax that wasn't applied to Rabbis, Priests, women, children, or any old men or women. In today's terms, it is two coffee lattes a month per family!

What's more amazing than the author pretension not to be able to read or understand a simple verse, is his interpretations and conclusions out of the simple English words. An example; where did the author come up with the word or meaning of a constant reminder of "their subordinate position"?!

Where is it in any tax law of any country in the world that tax evaders are not jailed and their properties not seized? Worse, who in his right mind would call that legal punishment, a "discriminatory regulation"?!

In what is known as the "Reddah" wars at the time of Caliph Abu Bakr - the first Caliph - the Muslim army had to fight Muslims who actually testified a certification of Islam, when these Muslims refused to pay their tax of the obligated charity "Zakah." They were battled by the Muslim army itself.
Would the same government then let non-Muslims in the same community not pay their proportionate tax obligations?
Is the author suggesting that for the tax-laws to be non-discriminatory, minorities should not pay taxes at all?!

Even when the author brings his translation of the word "Zemmey", he confuses the reader almost to a comedic level. On page 153 he wrote: "The Jews and Christians who agreed to pay the Jizyah were known as dhimmis, which means "protected" or "guilty" people."

The author, with his obviously not so-superb Arabic skills comments that the Arabic word means both "protected" and "guilty"!!

The word "zemmey" comes from the Arabic word "zemmah", which means the "account of" or "in the trust of." So a "Zemmey" is the person whose well-being is trusted with the Muslim state or the Muslims. It is almost as when I trust my children to my brother where, in that case, he is responsible for them or they are in his "Zemmah".

Our author spends an entire paragraph trying to convince his reader how Zemmey - in his unique vocabulary - somehow means "guilty"!
Did the Arabs or the Muslims ever say in their language that Zemmey means "Guilty"? Never! In that paragraph, the author conjures up justifications that neither have basis in the Arabic language, or even any reality. He further tries to say that Zemmeys are only Christians and Jews, and not pagans! This is not true.
Zemmeys are any non-Muslims who live in a Muslim land, so all Christians and Jews are Zemmeys, but not all Zemmeys are Christians and Jews. The author then explains his made-up meaning of the word Zemmey - a new invention in the Arabic language - and justifies that they are guilty because they did not believe in God or his Prophet. Which is an imagination of the author as linguistically fictitious as - and I am serious here - claiming that the word Zemmeys, also means "Ice Cream".

It is worth mentioning here that in Islamic law there is no such a word that could mean minority. Laws are applied exactly the same upon all people whether they are one of a kind or the entire majority of the land. An example is what we have mentioned in the event of the stolen shield of Ali Ibn Abi Taleb.

Then the author refers to verse 33 in the same chapter "Al-Tawbah" without daring to bring the translation of the verse itself! He wrote:
"One Muslim jurist explained that the Caliph must "make Jihad against those who resist Islam""

*A question arises as to why not state what the verse - selected by the author himself - is stating regarding the claim at hand instead of quoting that one unique Muslim jurist that doesn't have a name?
The verse says (our translation):

"**It is He who has sent His messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to proclaim it over all man-made religions, even if the infidels detested it.**"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) Ch (9) Verse (33)

هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ (33)

Why didn't the author bring the translation of the verse this time? Is it because it speaks not only just of the infidels, but also about peacefully proclaiming the true religion of God over all man-made religions? The author goes back and proves himself wrong again just a page ago, when he admits that Zemmeys were not just the Christians and Jews as he claimed. On page 154 he wrote:
"Muhammad also extended the Dhimma to Zoroastrians, a Persian religious sect."

*Even though Muhammad (PBUH) did not extend it, for that was the original rule; that all non-Muslims were Zemmeys.
Evidenced by the fact that one of the Muslim leaders of a territory as per the story that the author himself brought, asked about the Zemmey rule where he had Jews and Zoroastrians in his domain. That could not have been an indication of a rule that Jews and Christians were the only Zemmeys, otherwise he would have not asked. When the Prophet told

him, the Prophet was informing him of the rule itself, which is that all non-Muslims are Zemmeys.

And as if we did not have enough weird conclusions of the author in the past couple of pages, he shoots another pink elephant, flying high. The author claims that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), in his writing to the Zoroastrians indicated, on page 154 that:
"The non-Muslim is unclean"!!

*How and where did the author come up with that conclusion? The author tells us because the Prophet "told them that Muslims would not eat meat that they had slaughtered."

When conservative Jews eat only kosher meat - Kosher meat is also Halal for the Muslims to eat - that is slaughtered according to a certain religious code, is that then sending the rest of the world a message that they're all unclean?
Even when an atheist American refuses to eat any regular supermarket beef, because for example he only eats organic beef, do the rest of us then need to take a shower?!

"The Tabuk raid"

The author insults the intelligence of his readers when he starts the paragraph with a statement that is presented like a given fact. The only fact related to his statement is that it is not true.

On page 154, the author wrote:
"After commanding his followers to make war against Christians, Muhammad resolved to set an example for his followers. In 631, he ordered the Muslims to begin preparations for a raid on Tabuk, then a part of the Byzantine Empire."

*Needless to say, the author and all Muslim-haters amongst orientalists could never come up with just one verse in the Holy Quran or

one correct Hadeeth of the Prophet that even as little as hints that either Allah or his Prophet had ever commanded the Muslims to wage a war against Christians because they were Christians. The author implied as if Muhammad (PBUH) had just decided to expand for the sake of expansion, and that it just happened that the Prophet decided to start with Tabuk. Yet, just in the following page, on page 155, the author himself admits the real reason why the Prophet wanted to attack Tabuk!
The author wrote:
"They found that the Byzantine troops had withdrawn rather than engage them." Pg. 155

So, there were troops at Tabuk that were ready to engage the Muslims. If the Prophet prepares his army and decides tactically to attack them first, it was then an utmost necessity for him and the Muslims. The fact that the Byzantine army that was to attack the Muslims from Tabuk, was of the majority of the Christian faith, had absolutely nothing to do with either the fact that they were an army that was about to attack the Muslims, or with the Prophet's reaction to that threat as an army leader defending his people.

Even though there was no battle, the author insisted on coloring the event with a materialistic goal he wanted to paint the Prophet of God with regardless of the fact, which is obligating the residence of the area that has then become under Islamic rule then, to pay their due tax to the government that was then responsible for them.
On page 155 the author wrote:
"But the trip was not for naught: Muhammad accepted the submission of several of the area leaders, who agreed to pay the Jizyah and submit to the protection of the Muslims."

*Did we say enough times that "Islam" means "submission" to God and to no one else!

One of the interesting aspects of the author's narrative is that it is totally disconnected from not only reality in general, but mostly from the world realities of the seventh century itself!

The author will admit the facts later about the Jizyah that the Zemmeys were obligated to pay to the Muslim government, which, as we have mentioned before, was only one dinar!
Such tax is equivalent to about 100 of 2010 dollars, and that was due annually! Yet, the author makes the non-Muslims to look like they were taken advantage of, as if they never paid taxes to their oppressors or leaders before in their life, whether they were ruled by Romans, Persians, or Pagans in general!
Reality of the real world at the time is that the same Roman Empire when occupied Egypt had imposed 14 different taxes on the average Egyptian, which I assure you were more than one Dinar per year, and if the poor Egyptian didn't pay, the outcome he was to suffer would have been a totally different story!
Did the Roman Empire occupy the East for almost ten centuries because they wanted to travel from Europe to the East and donate gold to the local Arabs personally? Or so did the Persians?
As a matter of fact, during the 1400 years of Islamic History, the conditions of the Muslim states went in the normal historical cycles of strength and weakness, where major parts of the Muslim states were under constant attack from outside forces and, sometimes, were occupied for centuries, by non-Muslims. But the amazing factor that objective historians would attribute the huge populations of these areas keeping their Islamic faith at all times is the fairness, justice and equality of Islamic law when it was applied upon them.
Another testimony:

"In their early years the Arabs never oppressed anyone for their religion and didn't push anyone to convert to their religion, therefore Semite Christians enjoyed freedoms after the early expansions of Islam that they never enjoyed for generations"
Leon Catani (1869-1926) The Italian prince and orientalist

A major example is the incident of Ukaider Ibn Abdel Malik, which demonstrates the relentless charade of forcing Islamic history into the preset "crazy Jihadist warrior" mold of Mr. Spencer.

He was a Christian ruler of an area called Daumat Al Jandal. The Prophet sent a faction of 420 soldiers led by Khalid Ibn Al Waleed to fold that area into the control of the Muslim state. The Prophet told Khalid about the leader of that area:

"You will find him hunting for cattle"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Khalid Ibn Alwaleed. **Reference** Sunan al bayhaqi, **Number**: 187/9. **Degree**: Correct*

Before the army had reached the fort of the area, Ukaider, their leader, was tempted by wild cattle scratching the door of the fort with its horns, so he left his fort to hunt the cattle with his entourage including his brother Hassan. The two sides met and even though the Muslims outnumbered the entourage, Hassan challenged the Muslims and continued fighting to his death. Ukaider was brought to the Prophet where he agreed to keep his religion and pay his Jizyah as a citizen in the Muslim state while keeping his position amongst his people.
The Author claims on page 155 that:
"Jihad warriors led by the fierce Khalid Ibn Al Waleed captured him while he was hunting cattle: Ukaider's brother was killed in the Melee"

Please notice the key words that the author plants falsely in the story like - you guessed it!
"Jihad warriors" and "captured". The notion is that the rich Ukaider with his golden robe was "captured" by the wild warriors where his brother was killed in cold blood.
First of all, Ukaider was in his fort because the Muslims were on their way imminently.
Secondly, the entourage was fully armed, for definitely they weren't hunting cattle with just harsh words!
Hassan, Ukaider's brother made the decision that his brother refused to make, which was to fight the Muslims who vastly outnumbered them.
What was the Muslim soldier whom Hassan engaged to do other than engage him? But then what was the final outcome?

Ukaider was brought to Muhammad (PBUH) where he accepted the rule of the Muslims, no one forced him to change his religion, and agreed to paying the Jizyah which was much less that what the Romans imposed upon Daumat Al Jandal, that by the way was controlled not by the locals or by Ukaider fighters, but by the Roman army.

The author then claims that verse 30 in Chapter 9 in the Holy Quran is directly related to the battle of Tabuk, which is not true; evidenced by the fact that in the author's claim the verse was among the harshest toward Jews and Christians!
On Page 155 he wrote:
"Revelations Muhammad received, referring to the Tabuk raid were among the harshest toward Jews and Christians than any that he had ever received before. They asserted that Jews called Ezra son of God, just as Christians called Christ Son of God".

Why is the truth that is prevalent till today and stated by God, harsh?! Does the majority of Christians believe that Jesus is son of God or it is just a harsh and false allegation fabricated by the Muslims?! And so was the claim of some of the Jews about Ezra. What is the meaning of the word "harshest" in Mr. Spencer's dictionary?
The Jews in addition, were not any part of the Roman army to be mentioned, not to mention that the verse speaks broadly about thousands of year's worth of violations amongst some of the Jews and 600 years of that amongst some of the Christians.
In the Holy Quran (our translation):

"Jews called Uzayr a son of Allah and Christians called Christ the son of Allah. That it is a saying with their mouths by which they imitate what the disbelievers of old used to say. Allah will battle them for how they were deluded away from the truth."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) (The Repentance) Ch (9) Verse (30)

Please note that in Islamic law, "Allah will battle them" means that Allah will battle them! Meaning that this is not a worldly order to

Muslims to do it for God, for God doesn't need anyone's help, to say the least.

The author then brings the famous verses (31-32), where Allah had promised severe torture to those amongst the Jews and Christians who worshiped their Rabbis, Priests, or Saints.

And as we said before, the criticism that Allah specified to some of the Christians and the Jews was because they were blessed with true Prophets of God, with true scriptures of the word of God and yet some of their leaders went astray to associate their own status and other humans with that of God Himself, and took their followers astray with them. Uday Ibn Hatem Altaeiy was a former Christian who heard the Prophet recites verse 31:

"They took their Rabbis and Priests as gods against Allah."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) (The Repentance) Ch (9) Verse (31)

اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَالْمَسِيحَ ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ وَمَا أُمِرُوا إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا إِلَٰهًا وَاحِدًا ۖ لَا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ *(31)*

Ibn Altaeiy wondered as a former Christian and asked the Prophet, "Oh Prophet of Allah, they were not worshipping them." ..Meaning that, as a former Christian, he did not see Christians bowing and worshipping the Priests. The Prophet replied, saying:

"No, but they made what was allowed by God forbidden, and allowed what was forbidden by God, and they (their followers) **still followed them, and that's the worshipping of their followers to them."**
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Addey Ibn Hatem Altayee. Reference: Saheeh Al Tarmazy, Number: 3095. Degree: Good

The meaning here is that one's practcal deity is whomever he follows and obeys in reality against God's orders that were sent with His Prophets.

The constant aspect of the narratives of Mr. Spencer, in which the author portrays a specific prejudice against Christians and Jews whether by Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) or even by God Himself, is as we explained several times so far, not only untrue, but actually the opposite of the truth. Jews and Christians, throughout the entire Holy Quran, are called by the noble name "people of the Scriptures".

The specific difference between some of the people of the Scriptures and others can be seen clearly in the Holy Quran, in Surat Al-Saff:

"Oh, you who believe, Be supporters of the Cause of Allah as said 'Eeesa (Jesus), son of Maryam to the disciples: "Who are my supporters in the Cause of Allah?" The disciples said: "We are Allah's supporters" Then a group of the sons of Israel believed and a group disbelieved. So We gave power to those who believed against their enemies, and they became the victorious "
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Saff) (The Row) Ch (61) Verse (14)

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُونُوا أَنْصَارَ اللَّهِ كَمَا قَالَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ لِلْحَوَارِيِّينَ مَنْ أَنْصَارِي إِلَى اللَّهِ ۖ قَالَ الْحَوَارِيُّونَ نَحْنُ أَنْصَارُ اللَّهِ ۖ فَآمَنَتْ طَائِفَةٌ مِنْ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَكَفَرَتْ طَائِفَةٌ ۖ فَأَيَّدْنَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا عَلَىٰ عَدُوِّهِمْ فَأَصْبَحُوا ظَاهِرِينَ (14)

There were Jews who believed in the Prophets of God, and there were Jews that fought the Prophets of God.

The ancient conflict in Christianity itself between Christians following the true teachings of Jesus (PBUH) as a Prophet of God and believed in the Oneness of God, represented by the eastern priest Arius against the Pauline Christianity followers, where Jesus was considered the son of God and God - even though there is not one verse in today's any Bible where Jesus (PBUH) says worship me - represented by the followers of the eastern priest Athanasius. Both sides accused the other side of blasphemy. In the previous verse of the Holy Quran, God Himself affirms that one of the factions is correct!
In The Holy Quran:

"...and you will find the nearest in love to the believers (Muslims) those who say: "We are Christians." That is because amongst them are priests and monks, and they are not proud.
And when they listen to what has been sent down to the Messenger (Muhammad (PBUH)) you see their eyes overflowing with tears because of the truth they have recognized. They say: "Our Lord! We believe; so write us down among the witnesses"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Maeda) (The Table) Ch (5) Verse (82-83)

وَلَتَجِدَنَّ أَقْرَبَهُمْ مَوَدَّةً لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّا نَصَارَىٰ ۚ ذَٰلِكَ بِأَنَّ مِنْهُمْ قِسِّيسِينَ وَرُهْبَانًا وَأَنَّهُمْ لَا يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ (82)
وَإِذَا سَمِعُوا مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ تَرَىٰ أَعْيُنَهُمْ تَفِيضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ مِمَّا عَرَفُوا مِنَ الْحَقِّ ۖ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا آمَنَّا فَاكْتُبْنَا مَعَ الشَّاهِدِينَ (38)

Also, in the Holy Quran, Allah brings the Muslims a comparison that shows that fine practical manners are not monopolized by Muslims:

"Among the people of the Scripture is he who, if entrusted with a Qintar (a heap of wealth), will readily pay it back; and among them there is he who, if entrusted with a single coin, will not repay it unless you constantly stand demanding"
Holy Quran, Surat (Ale Omran) Ch (3) Verse (75)

وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ مَنْ إِنْ تَأْمَنْهُ بِقِنْطَارٍ يُؤَدِّهِ إِلَيْكَ وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ إِنْ تَأْمَنْهُ بِدِينَارٍ لَا يُؤَدِّهِ إِلَيْكَ إِلَّا مَا دُمْتَ عَلَيْهِ قَائِمًا ۗ (75)

On page 156, the author repeats his statements that have nothing to do with the fact or even the subject at hand. He wrote:
"Muhammad's wrath would also extend to Muslims who ignored Allah's Messenger."

*Where is that wrath and where did the author bring it from? He talks about the famous incident where the Prophet ordered a mosque to be destroyed and burned; why? A verse was revealed to the Prophet about the plot that Mosque was built for by the Hypocrites, in addition to

several correct quotations of the Prophet that narrated the incident in details. Even the identity of the hypocrites was stated by the name.

Why all these impeccable references weren't mentioned by Mr. Spencer and only the speculation of Mr. Spencer's "wraths", fury and imaginations?

The incident was when hypocrites, on their own, built a mosque where they gathered in to plot against the Muslims, mock and curse Islam and the Prophet. The Prophet didn't know of their actions to the limit that he promised them to lead prayers in their mosque, only just when he was about to go there to pray, a verse was revealed to him by God exposing the hypocrites. In the Holy Quran:

"And as for those who put up a mosque by way of harm and disbelief and to disunite the believers, and as an outpost for those who battled against Allah and His Messenger before, they will indeed swear that their intention is nothing but good. Allah bears witness that they are certainly liars"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) Ch (9) Verse (107)

وَالَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا مَسْجِدًا ضِرَارًا وَكُفْرًا وَتَفْرِيقًا بَيْنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَإِرْصَادًا لِمَنْ حَارَبَ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ مِن قَبْلُ ۚ وَلَيَحْلِفُنَّ إِنْ أَرَدْنَا إِلَّا الْحُسْنَىٰ ۖ وَاللَّهُ يَشْهَدُ إِنَّهُمْ لَكَاذِبُونَ (107)

Should the Prophet of God obey God and bring down a place that was built upon hypocrisy and damaging God's religion? Of course yes. Is it then the "wrath of Muhammad" or is it God himself exposing the hypocrites?

The author then adds the verses in Surat Al-Tawbah, where Allah criticizes the defectors of the Muslim army, which we covered earlier and we will not waste the reader's time explaining - again - as to how every country in the world treats their army defectors.

Then on page 157, the author, brings a claim of which he did not find a source to support, even amongst his worthless sources. He wrote: "Though Muhammad may not have needed the help, Jihad for the sake of

Allah (Jihad fi-sabil Allah which denotes in Islamic theology armed struggle to establish the hegemony of the Islamic social order) is the best deed a Muslim can perform Quran 9:41".

*What is worse than the fact that this hegemony statement is totally not true in the entire Holy Quran and in the Sunnah of the Prophet, is that the transliteration the author quoted means literally "Jihad for the sake of Allah" where did the hegemony come from? My guess is from where all the blue elephants flys high every time!

The verse the author claimed proves that statement is verse 9:41!! The author only added its number at the end of the paragraph and never quoted it!! I wonder why?

How possible is it, that a claim as crucial to the validity of the author's entire narrative, which is that Jihad of the Muslims is to dominate the world under an Islamic social order, was not worth it for the author to bring the translation of the verse he claimed proved it?!

The answer is simple, because the verse that the author brought to us, which is verse 9:41, has no relation to such claim.
In the Holy Quran (our translation):

"Go forth, whether lightly or heavily-equipped, and strive with your monies and yourselves for the sake of Allah. That is better for you, if you knew."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) Ch (9) Verse (41)

انْفِرُوا خِفَافًا وَثِقَالًا وَجَاهِدُوا بِأَمْوَالِكُمْ وَأَنْفُسِكُمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ۚ ذَٰلِكُمْ خَيْرٌ لَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ (41)

Where is the mention of hegemony of the Islamic social order over the world, in verse 41 or anywhere in the entire Holy Quran?!!

From creating new meanings of Arabic words like "zemmey" to be meaning "guilty", now the author is making up verses out of his imagination to support his laughable claims!

The author, then follows by a weak hadeeth in which the Prophet stated that there is no deed a Muslim can do that can equal the reward of Jihad.

In the well-known "correct" Hadeeth of the Prophet, he was asked about the best deed that a Muslim can do in the sight of Allah. Jihad did not even make the first two! The Prophet replied:

"Establishing prayers on time, doing well by parents, and then striving for the sake of Allah."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abdullah Ibn Masoud. Reference: Saheeh Al Buckhary, Number: 7534. Degree: Correct

In our preface of the book, we brought examples of other deeds that equal joining the army and fighting for the sake of God; only they are correct quotations of the Prophet, and not weak quotations, fabricated or from the imagination of Mr. Spencer.

"The sponsor of a widow or a needy person, is like the one making Jihad for the sake of God, or Praying at night, and fasting at day"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Abou Hurayra. **Reference**: Saheeh Al Buckhary, **Number**: 5353. **Degree**: Correct.*

When a young man wanted to join the Muslim army, the Prophet asked him if his mother was alive, when the young man said yes, the Prophet ordered him:

"Go and keep her company, for paradise is underneath her feet" i.e. serving his mother supersedes joining the army.
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator**: Moawea Ibn Jahema Alsalmy. **Reference**: Al Albany of Saheeh Alnasaye, **Number**: 3104. **Degree**: Correct/Good.*

On page 157, the author refers to verse 43 in Surat Al-Tawba (9:43), the author wrote:

"He told Muhammad that true Muslims did not hesitate to wage jihad, even to the point of risking their property and their very lives."

By now, the pattern of excessively misleading verse translations is being coupled with the fact that such verses that have no relation to his subject are the ones that the author would not quote or even show his erroneous translations for!

In the Holy Quran, verse 9:43 says (our translation):

"Allah gave you grace, why did you grant them exemption till those who told the truth were seen by you and you have learned the liars?"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) Ch (9) Verse (43)

عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْكَ لِمَ أَذِنْتَ لَهُمْ حَتَّىٰ يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكَ الَّذِينَ صَدَقُوا وَتَعْلَمَ الْكَاذِبِينَ (43)

Allah indicates to the Prophet that he pardoned too early those who stayed behind and didn't participate in battle before Allah had brought the truthful forward so the liars of those who were pardoned were known to the Prophet.

As a clear conclusion, the verse speaks of the leniency and the forgiveness of the Prophet towards hypocrites who stayed behind when the battle was about to start. Allah is telling us that the Prophet should have waited and not given his forgiveness till the truth of the liars was completely revealed. The verse talked about hypocrites who brought in false excuses so they don't join their nation's army that was going to battle. In that specific battle, as the author himself admitted on page 155, the Roman army, and by that I mean the army of the most powerful empire of the world, camped at Tabuk with the evident intention of attacking the Muslims. If the Muslim army would not go to fight to defend themselves against the most formidable of enemies, what would the army then be in existence for to begin with?
And what would be the judgment upon those who have seen the army of the most powerful empire in the world about to attack their nation and chose to sit back?

Most importantly is the question: where in the verse does it say anything close to "wage jihad"? What is the meaning of the word "wage" used by our creative author, as if it was a Muslim provocation?
What does it mean in comparison to the truth admitted by the author himself that the Roman army was marching and camping outside the frontiers of the Muslim territory?

And if this specific incident does not fit the exact clear definition of striving for the sake of God, "jihad" that we have explained within the Holy Quran and the correct tradition of the Prophet several times already in this book, then what would be the true definition of jihad if it wasn't? Would trying to stand up and defend your nation against the Romans suffice?

Was that "waging" an uncalled for war against the peaceful Romans? Or is it just about emptying truthfulness out of words, and packaging them in with scary slogans that fit the author's scare crow narrative? The verse has nothing to do with the matter at hand, and no wonder the author did not quote it!

On page 158, the author wrote commenting on his translation of verses 73 and 74 of Surat Al-Tawba (Chapter 9):
"this "striving hard" was, in the context of Muhammad's circumstances, unmistakably a military command - particularly in light of the fact that Allah was guaranteeing paradise to those who would "fight in the way of Allah and shall slay and be slain" (Holy Quran 9:111)".

*The author drags us into having to explain rudimentary concepts about basic formations of societies! What the armies of every nation on the face of the planet are in existence for today?

Is it draining national budgets by the tunes of hundreds of billions of dollars?

Or is it to defend not only against the nation's enemies, but in addition, protect national interests, whatever that may be, according to the liking

of the politicians at the time? Our Pentagon for example has an annual budget that is pushing 600 billion dollars a year, I wonder why!!

Even as a universal concept, what is an enemy of any nation? I assure you that the definition at any given time does differ greatly. You will not even be able to put one simple line that you can claim fulfill that description to any nation in the world.

The definition of an enemy to be fought at any cost for the Muslim nation, however, is those who are enemies of Allah, Creator of mankind, heavens and earth. It is as simple as that.
That enemy of Allah is not a loose expression that would fit whomever the politician du jour would like it to be. The clear-cut definition in Islamic law is that an enemy of Allah is not an enemy who does not believe in Allah. Those, Allah will punish in this life and on Judgment Day when they stand before Him, and in a way such punishment no man-made punishment or war can equate. An enemy of Allah that Muslims should oppose is an enemy to mankind. Those who oppress the rights of the innocent, hurt the righteous, spread corruption and devastation on Earth, and take away mankind's God-given rights that are stated clearly in Islamic Law.

Simply put, according to Islamic law, you take violent actions against the justice that God had given mankind or oppress people; you are fought with every means possible as an enemy of God Himself.
Having said all that, and as per the author's emphasis on the loose translation: what difference, "striving hard", medium, or extra-large against such an enemy is relevant, when it comes to that?
In the Holy Quran:

"Allah does not forbid you to deal justly and kindly with those who did not fight you for your religion and did not drive you out of your homes. Verily, Allah loves those who deal justly" [8]
"It is only in regards to those who fought you for your religion, have driven you out of your homes, and helped to drive you out, that

Allah forbids you to befriend them. And whoever will befriend them, then those are the oppressors" [9]
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Mumtahina) Ch. (60), verses (8- 9)

لَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُوكُمْ مِنْ دِيَارِكُمْ أَنْ تَبَرُّوهُمْ وَتُقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ (8

إِنَّمَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الَّذِينَ قَاتَلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَأَخْرَجُوكُمْ مِنْ دِيَارِكُمْ وَظَاهَرُوا عَلَىٰ إِخْرَاجِكُمْ أَنْ تَوَلَّوْهُمْ ۚ وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ (9

In the same paragraph on page 158, the author brings one of the quotations of the Prophet that are very conveniently misinterpreted by Islam-bashers, and I would have been surprised if the author did not bring it. The famous quotation in Saheeh Al-Bukhari, where the Prophet had said:

"I was ordered to fight people till they testify that there's no God but Allah and that Muhammad is His Messenger, so if they said it, then they have forbade me their monies and blood, except by which is justified by the law. And their accounts are settled by Allah."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Hurayrah. Reference: Saheeh Al Buckhary, Number: 2946. Degree: Correct

The quotation of the Prophet is clearly about that if the conditions of war force the Prophet to fight, then he will fight till those who fought him are defeated or till they accept Islam - go back to the three offers that Muslims give before battle - the trick that is played in the English translation is the generalization of the word "people". As if Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is commanded by God to fight every single non-Muslim till either they die or become Muslim!!

Before we show the correct translation of the exact Arabic word, I would like to ask the reader a very simple question: Did the Prophet do that in reality? Did the Prophet fight every single person that was not a Muslim till he killed them or till they converted?!! Had the Muslims even done that throughout history?

Even the author himself, with his "subjugating" and "second-class citizen" claims about non-Muslims in Muslim societies, cannot deny that these claims themselves are an absolute proof that Muslims were not commanded to kill non-Muslims if they didn't accept Islam. Otherwise, all these supposedly second-class citizens would have been killed, and would have not existed at all to begin with! Here is another testimony:

"In Italy, many regions expressed to their oppressing rulers their hearty welcome to a Turkish (Muslim) invasion like the Balkan Christians did"
Maxime Rodinson (1915- 2004)

Why did the Muslims throughout history constantly enjoy that exceptional, impeccable record of tolerating minorities of all kinds? Or is it that the author's conclusion and translation are totally misleading?

The literal translation of the critical sentence of the quotation is "to fight the people". "The people" - in Arabic - here does not mean at all "all mankind" or "all people". It is like, for example, when you say to a teacher, "the students are here". That does not mean that every student on the face of the planet had come to attend that teacher's class! "The" in the Arabic language here is used to identify the group of students that both the speaker and the teacher know. A clear description of what the phrase "to fight the people" means "to fight the people I will fight." I.e. this referred to the pagans and the infidels that will fight the Prophet imminently and regardless.

Even the claimed crazy "jihad warriors" that the author is relentless in being their sincere publicist; do not say "we will fight everyone on the face of the planet till we kill them or till they become Muslim"!! Only Mr. Spencer is claiming that!

"Collecting the jizya"

Even though we have discussed the Jizyah / Zemmey tax issue in details, but we will comment on the whole issue from the author's narrative. Before we start, I want to bring to the reader's attention that Mr. Spencer at this point, when we're about to get into the last chapter of

his book, never called a member of the Muslim army by the name he would have called any member of any other army in the world, which is "soldier". In the eyes of the author, Muslims cannot be soldiers in their own army, but always only "jihad warriors"! Even when he described Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) on page 158 as "Muhammad was now the undisputed master of Arabia.", where the Muslim army was the dominant army in the entire Arab Peninsula, it's still not an army of soldiers, but an army of whatever his beloved "jihad warriors" expression means.

On page 158, another fabrication, where the author again and again brings a fabrication that the Prophet told a messenger from a tribe who just accepted Islam, that if they didn't accept Islam he would have "thrown your heads beneath your feet."

*The reader by now knows that that never happened, that the options were accept Islam, keep your religion with paying your share of tax, or war, which as we have displayed earlier many times in the book and what Mr. Spencer admitted himself! The question to Mr. Spencer here is; what happened to digging for buried treasures, subjugating non-Muslims and calming the crazed Jihad warriors with Jizyah monies' claims of his? What did change the rules of Islam alongside his usual fictitious claims this time? Why to the Muslims that people accepting Islam is better than all the money in the world all of a sudden this time? May be it is a fabrication in keeping with the only rule Mr. Spencer adheres to in his book?!

On page 159, the same author who on just the last page said: "The inverse is also true: if they do not become Muslims, their blood and riches are not guaranteed any protection from the Muslims.", is now stating just one page later, that the Muslim army was instructed that if Christians and Jews refused to accept Islam, ", they were "not to be turned" from their religions."!!

With that clear admission of the fact by the author after the splitting headache that we had throughout his book that Muslims would

wage war against you to become a Muslim or they would kill you, would the author change his narrative then?! Read on!

The author then makes the claim that the Jizyah was imposed upon every non-Muslim individual. As we have stated before, Jizyah in Islamic law is imposed only on men who are able to carry a weapon and fight.
No women, children, old men or women, rabbis or priests are subject to pay Jizyah. The author however stated correctly the value of that huge, whopping, overwhelming amount the Jizyah tax was, which in his words was "subjugating" to non-Muslims! On page 158, the author imposes the Jizyah - on his own - upon every non-Muslim- he wrote:
"Must pay the poll tax for every adult, male or female, free or slave, one full dinar."

The one full dinar equates less than a hundred dollars today and that's per year, per the able to fight man in the family if any!

Then the author brings an issue that is of surprisingly major interest to evangelists and Islam-bashers, which is that no non-Muslim worshipping establishments are allowed in the Arab Peninsula as per God's orders to His Prophet - and not wishes - as the author claimed.

Every religion has its own sanctuary where only that religion is worshipped within that specific area. I don't remember that either Muslims or Jews had ever complained that there are no mosques or Jewish temples in the Vatican, understandably because the Vatican is the sanctuary of Catholicism. And while no Jew or Muslim had ever dictated to the Pope of the Vatican the size of the Vatican borders as to how big or small that sanctuary should be, it's really puzzling why some are so blind to the fact that the area that houses the holiest places for 1.6 billion Muslims is understandably God's choice of the sanctuary of the religion of Islam!

On page 159, the author comments about the Prophet of God's order to make the Arab peninsula the sanctuary of the religion of Islam. He wrote:

"He gave just such an order on his deathbed. Today the kingdom of Saudi Arabia neighbors labors zealously that the Prophet's wishes in this regard are scrupulously honored."

In the following paragraph, the author points to a phenomenon that is unique only to the Muslims! It is that tax collected by a nation form its citizens as a source of income to that nation!!

On page 159 he wrote:
"The Jizyah tax was so important because, besides raiding, which produced inconsistent results, it was the Muslim's chief source of income."

In commenting again on the Jizyah tax, the author's clear imagination requires our clarification:

1. Non-Muslims can become Muslims, or if they choose not to, should pay the Jizyah tax, yet the author never said a word about the tax a Muslim is obligated to pay! The Zakah tax is two and a half percent of your unspent assets at the end of the year. So, naturally, Muslims paid their due tax to their government, but notice as well that the amount a Muslim should pay in tax is limitless, because the more money that a Muslim would make and the more assets he would gather, the limitless amount of taxes he would pay. Compare that to the fixed low amount of one dinar per able fighter per year, no matter how much assets that non-Muslim has.

2. The smaller number of non-Muslims compared to the overwhelmingly increasing number of people accepting Islam was minimal in the amount of tax raised from non-Muslims versus that obligated charity tax of all Muslims. That brings us to another nugget of wisdom of the author at the end of the paragraph on page 160, where he wrote:
"The onerous tax burdens that Jews and Christians in Muslim domains incurred for the privileges of being allowed to live in relative peace would become the key source of income for the great Islamic empires that carried Muhammad's jihad into Africa, Europe, and Asia."!

Really!

Please notice the "onerous tax burdens" that the author claims collected from a tribe as a whole was 25% of just their income, not the assets. That "onerous" tax bracket would be a joy if applied to our author's income today, especially when we learn how much he makes in the business of bashing Islam and Muslims. In America today, my guesstimate is that he's closer to the 40% tax bracket. I think he would have done much better with Muhammad!

"The last pilgrimage, the rights of women, and the expulsion of the pagans"

On page 160, the author makes - again - a major mistranslation when the author brought a translation of the famous correct quotation of the Prophet in the last pilgrimage. The author translated the Quotation in the most bizarre but telling way of what his entire narrative against Islam is about.
Here is the famous quotation in Arabic for reference:

" فاتقوا الله في النساء ، فإنكم أخذتموهن بأمانة الله ، واستحللتم فروجهم بكلمه الله

Here is the correct translation (our translation):

"So fear Allah about your women, for you have <u>taken them</u> with the trust of Allah, and your intercourse with them was allowed to you by the word of Allah" (Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Jaber ibn abdu Allah. Reference: Saheeh Al jamee, Number: 2068. Degree: Correct

What would our truth-seeker translate the word "take" as in Mr. Jones taking Mrs. Jones as a wife? To Mr. Spencer it means taking her as a "prisoner"!!

Our truth-seeker wrote:
"Lay injunctions on women kindly, for <u>they are prisoners</u> for you having no control of their persons. You have taken them only as a trust of God, and you have the enjoyment of their persons by the words of God…."

On page 161, and in commenting on Mr. Spencer's misleading translation, the author brings a famous verse that Islam-haters always love to bring, and of course, without the clear context of the example of the behavior of Muhammad (PBUH) himself. The verse stated the steps of how to deal with a wife that is being suspected of wanting to cheat on her husband.
Firstly, give her clear advice, as per the orders of Allah of the rights and obligations between the couple.
Secondly, if the wife would still disobey the orders of Allah that are applicable upon her and her husband just the same, then the husband should abstain from her in the same bed.
Thirdly, if the wife would continue with the same behavior, the verse dictates a psychological light beating that is less than a slap on the wrist, which most of the companions of the Prophet likened to slapping someone lightly with a toothbrush-like piece of branch on the wrist. That "beating" is obviously more of a psychological impact upon the wife than any minimal physical impact might be. But does the author quote the people that received the verse, asked how it was applied during the life of the Prophet of God himself? The answer is no, for that does not fit the narrative of the author.

Taking Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) himself as the ultimate example of all Muslims: did our author and his unreliable sources, with all their satanic verses, and fabrications, bring one iota of an attempted fabrication that the Prophet had ever laid one finger or even said one foul word to any of his wives, no matter what the circumstances were? Never. Not to mention that at one point, the Prophet was about to divorce them all for repeatedly asking for materialistic things, yet in all circumstances, the Prophet was the kindest person they had ever seen.

Ayesha, the Prophet's wife, described the Prophet:
"He was the most lenient of all people, laughing and smiling."

On page 161, the author wrote:
"This was in accord with revelations Muhammad had received from

Allah concerning women, which included the beating of disobedient wives."

The verse that the author had brought out is another example of misinforming the reader by omitting the facts included in the same verse that does not fit the author's convoluted narrative. The entire first part that shapes the general guideline of the relationship between a husband and a wife is totally omitted by the author without mention. Here is the first part of the verse that the author intentionally omitted from his translation in the Holy Quran (our translation):

"Men are the protectors and maintainers of women, because Allah has made one of them to excel the other, and because they spend (to support them) from their means"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nissaa) (The women) Ch. (4), verses (34)

الرِّجَالُ قَوَّامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ بِمَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَىٰ بَعْضٍ وَبِمَا أَنفَقُوا مِنْ أَمْوَالِهِمْ ۚ (34)

How significant is that in light of presenting Muslims as wife-beaters? The verse mandated men to protect and provide sustenance to their wives as a condition of attending to them. Yet, the truth-seeker on his own omits the words of God. He started his translation on page 161 by saying:
"So good women are the obedient, guarding in secret that which Allah has guarded. . . ."

Here's the correct translation of the entire verse, (our translation) in the Holy Quran:

"Men are the protectors and maintainers of women, because Allah has made one of them to excel the other, and because they spend (to support them) from their means. Therefore the righteous women are devoutly obedient and guard in the husband's absence what Allah orders them to guard. As to those women on whose part you see ill-conduct, admonish them (first), (next), refuse to share their beds, (and last) beat them (lightly, if it is useful); but if they return to obedience, seek not means against them .Surely, Allah is Ever Most

High, Most Great."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nissaa) (The women) Ch. (4), verses (34)

الرِّجَالُ قَوَّامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ بِمَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَىٰ بَعْضٍ وَبِمَا أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ أَمْوَالِهِمْ ۚ فَالصَّالِحَاتُ قَانِتَاتٌ حَافِظَاتٌ لِلْغَيْبِ بِمَا حَفِظَ اللَّهُ ۚ وَاللَّاتِي تَخَافُونَ نُشُوزَهُنَّ فَعِظُوهُنَّ وَاهْجُرُوهُنَّ فِي الْمَضَاجِعِ وَاضْرِبُوهُنَّ ۖ فَإِنْ أَطَعْنَكُمْ فَلَا تَبْغُوا عَلَيْهِنَّ سَبِيلًا ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلِيًّا كَبِيرًا (34)

On page 161, the author makes a shocking contradiction to his own self and his own words, when he comments on Allah's order in Surat Al-Tawba, 9:1-2 to exile all the non-Muslims from the Islamic religion's sanctuary of Arabia. On page 161 he wrote:
"these unbelievers were pagan Arabs, not Jews and Christians, hence here there is no mention of the Jizyah option he had already offered to the latter. For Jews and Christians their choices were conversion, subjugation, or war; for the pagans the choices were only conversion or war."

As we stated before, the Jizyah was applied to every non-Muslim living within the Muslim society. It is laughable that the author claimed that a non-Muslim atheist living in the Muslim society is not asked to pay tax, while the Muslims and the Christians and the Jews are paying their respective taxes! The issue that the author is discussing here was supposedly putting every non-Muslim out of the sanctuary of Arabia. So how is it that for all that time these "unbelievers pagan Arabs" had lived in the Muslim society without paying tax - if the author is correct - till the order came to exile all non-Muslims out of the Arab Peninsula?!

Did the savage Muslims kill them all because they were non-Muslims, then they came back to life and lived tax-free till they were exiled?!

The whole convoluted logic and mutilation of the fact is again an only resource available for the author to support his narrative that the Jizyah tax was some kind of prejudice against Jews and Christians, which the same author describes later as a benefit when he claims it was later "extended" to non-Muslims!

Even worse, everything Muslim to the author is a cup half-empty and the other half is always filled with poison. On page 161, he wrote: "Only conversion to Islam would save the lives of the unbelievers and only the hope that they would accept Islam would gain them mercy from the Muslims."

Why would the Muslims, who were a chapter ago pirates and gold-diggers, hope that non-Muslims become Muslims? Isn't it better to fight them then seize their properties as spoils of war? Why would someone becoming a Muslim and worshipping God be a "hope" for Muslims over his money, his property, and his wealth if he didn't become a Muslim?

Is it that their entire struggle is only for the sake of God and His reward, by freeing humanity from the oppressors and the rule of injustice?

An order was made that non-Muslims have four months to take all their property and move to wherever they want, whenever they want, out of the sanctuary of Islam. If after the four months during which a pagan was fully-protected by the Muslims, a non-Muslim stays, then he would be considered a law breaker and would be fought accordingly.

This was not a hidden deceptive rule, but the rule declared to everyone. So if you stayed behind after the four months, the only way you could be exempted from that rule - surprisingly according to the author's logic - is that if that non-Muslim had accepted Islam, and became a Muslim with the same rights of all Muslims living within the sanctuary of Islam! The author himself brought in a part of the verse that mandated that Muslims are ordered to accept the repentance and the conversion of a non-Muslim, even if they doubted his Islam. On page 161, the author brought the part of the verse (his translation):

". . . if they repent, and establish regular prayers and practice regular charity, then open the way for them, for Allah is All-Forgiving, Most Merciful." (Holy Quran 9:4-6)

On page 162, the author quotes a Hindu "historian", Sita Ram Goel, where he fabricated a record of abhorring war crimes supposedly committed by the Muslim army in India. On page 162, Mr. Goel lists some of which even our author himself could not fabricate or prove that such claimed abhorring warfare by Mr. Goel is even close to anything in the Holy Quran or the manners of the Prophet. Had Mr. Goel brought any reference - historic, reliable, or otherwise - other than his Muslim bashing vivid imagination rant, we would have dignified his quote with a comment. But we won't.

"The murder of the poets"

On page 162, the author, again, makes claims about the Prophet's intentions or decisions that the author simply does not know and neither the Prophet nor his companions ever mentioned. He wrote: "Muhammad at this point was determined to wipe out every remnant of opposition to his rule. He set his sights on two poets, Abu Afak and Asma Bint Marwan, who had mocked him and his Prophetic pretensions and their verses."

Maybe the reader is now tired of us asking the truth-seeker, "Where did you get that from?"

And who does the author, again, only quote for the two incidents? Again and again, none other than Ibn Isḥâq.

"Muhammad's final illness"

On page 164, the author brings a weird irrelevant story about Ayesha having a headache and the Prophet wishing that he outlived her. Not only is the story not true, but to the issue of the death of the Prophet, any headache of Ayesha is totally irrelevant.

It is hard for me to even refute how low the author went in narrating the final hours of the Prophet of God.

The reason the author brought that fabricated story about Ayesha is for him to follow it with this: on page 164, the author used his time-machine video camera when he wrote:
"Ayesha responded to this with tart playfulness: "By Allah, I think you want me to die; and if this should happen, you would spend the last part of the day sleeping with one of your wives!" "
How absurdly low is this of the truth-seeker?!

The justice and fairness of the Prophet when he dealt with his wives was a model example for mankind.

The Holy Quran is the only Scripture that has actual verses against multiple wives. In the Old Testament, Abraham had three wives, Solomon had hundreds of wives, even in Christendom and till the early 1300s; men having multiple wives was the norm in Europe. Only in the middle of the 20th century and particularly in 1952, the leading Rabbi of Israel, Yehuda Bin Greshom, mandated that Eastern Jews should stop the practice of having multiple wives and keep only one wife.
In the Holy Quran:

"And you will not be able to be fair between wives even if you kept at it."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nissaa), (The women) Ch. (4), verses (129)

So using the license of multiple wives - up to four - in Islamic Law is an allowed exceptional remedy for exceptional situations with fair conditions. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), with a unique license to marry more than four for the reasons that we have stated earlier, was the most fair in treating all his wives. Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was so ill that when he made his last speech, they had to pour water on his face and he needed to be carried by two men to the mosque where he gave his last speech.

Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was unconscious and when he gained his consciousness, he was at the house of Ayesha, where he asked for all his wives to be brought in her house to talk to them. When the wives arrived, totally taken by concern and fear for not only their

husband but the last Prophet of God, they were shocked when the Prophet - barely conscious - asked their permission to allow him to stay in the house of Ayesha during his sickness, for he hadn't the strength to even walk to their houses as he scheduled. During his last moments, and while the Prophet knew that he was dying, all what concerned him was to be fair and not take away the right of another wife upon him to be at her house according to the schedule that he had for them. This right was his wives' and not his, so the last Prophet of God wanted their permission for it.

In his speech, which was the last speech the last Prophet of God would advise all mankind with, the Prophet gave three pieces of advice:

The first was to always establish prayers to God and never abandon them.

The second was to always treat all women well, saying:
"By Allah, I leave a trust with you to treat women well."

And by women, the Prophet did not mean only the wife, but the mother, the sister, the daughter, as well as the wife.

The third advice was to not let worldly, materialistic things distract believers so they will waste them and their deeds, like the nations before them that let materialistic things waste them by distracting them from their utmost duty - to worship God.

Let's look at how low the author goes in depicting the last Prophet of God as a sick man, screaming and asking for the next wife's turn!

On page 164, he wrote:
"As his illness progressed, he grew anxious over the fact that he had to move, spending each night in the house of a different wife, as had been his practice ever since he began practicing polygamy. He would cry out anxiously, "Where will I be tomorrow? Where will I be tomorrow?" Finally his other wives allowed him to stay in the home of his favorite wife, Ayesha." Could Mr. Spencer stoop any lower?!

On page 165, the author claims that the Muslims gathered in his room, where the Prophet amazingly asked them to bring something to write on! The author wrote:
"So that I may write to you something, after which you will never go astray." Pg. 165

The fact that Muhammad (PBUH) died illiterate and never read or wrote a word throughout his entire life makes you wonder whom the author thinks reads his books! Not only that Muslims at the time of worrying about the sickness of the Prophet gathered in the mosque where Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was carried and gave his final speech, but the story of him looking for something to write on, so suddenly, of which the believers would never go astray, a few hours before he was to die, is so laughable to even refute.

The only correct quotation by which the words or the meaning of "I want to give you something, after which you will never go astray" is one of the most famous quotations of the Prophet, which he said in the day of the last pilgrimage. And it is amazing in two aspects. The Prophet said:

"I left amongst you two things that which if you took or worked with, you will never go astray: the book of Allah, and my tradition."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Hurayra. Reference: Osoul Al Ahkam, Number: 251/2. Degree: Correct

So, months before the death of the Prophet, the Prophet had said that the two things that will keep believers from deviating from the path of God are the two things that all the Muslims of their time already had; the entire Holy Quran and an entire 23 years of the quotations and the traditions of the Prophet.

The second interesting aspect is that the one time that a quotation of the Prophet is also mentioned by the letter in a Quranic verse, is what the Prophet had said in one of the greatest days in the history of

mankind. Both the quote of the Prophet and the verse said; in the Holy Quran:

"Today I completed your religion for you and I perfected the favor (which Allah had bestowed upon me) upon you, and accepted Islam as your religion."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Maeda) (The table) Ch. (5), verse (3)

(3) ۞ الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

Islam, as a way of life and as a religion, was completed and perfected for all mankind at that great day in human history of the last pilgrimage of the last Prophet of God.

No other quotation of the Prophet has any wording or meaning of "I left you two things after which you will not go astray" other than the quotation and the verse that we just stated.

The claim that Muhammad (PBUH) on his deathbed anxiously tried to find a piece of paper to write a cure for all advice for the Muslims is more than laughable when we know that he was illiterate, and that the entire Holy Quran and the quotations of the Prophet were memorized verbatim from man to man through dictation during the 23 years of the Prophethood duration of Islam.

The two orders that the author claimed were given by the Prophet but not in that manner and definitely not on his deathbed. On page 165, the author wrote:
"Turn Al-Mushrikun out of the Arabian Peninsula; respect and give gifts to the foreign delegations as you have seen me dealing with them."

Why would the author mix timeframes and fabricate final moments for the Prophet? He tells us of his "noble" goal on page 165, when he wrote: "The unbelievers were much on his mind, even as he lay ill. Some Islamic traditions even claim that the Jews "bewitched" Muhammad (PBUH). When some of his wives began discussing a beautiful church they had seen in Abyssinia, festooned with gorgeous icons, Muhammad

(PBUH) sat up and said, "Those are the people who, whenever a pious man dies amongst them, make a place of worship at his grave and then they make those pictures in it. Those are the worst creatures in the sight of Allah." He added: "Allah cursed the Jews and the Christians because they took the graves of their Prophets as places of worship." Ayesha observed that had Muhammad (PBUH) not said this, "His grave would have been made conspicuous." "

In just half a page, the author mixes facts and fabrications in totally different timeframes and tries to push them into the last hours of the life of the Prophet.

Of course, as we said there's no such thing as Islamic traditions, which is a term used often for Christianity but a totally manufactured term for Islam by the author that could only mean to me, "made up" or "without any Islamic source or reference." The author claimed that some Muslims said that the Jews bewitched Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)! Not only is the Prophet of God protected by God Himself, but let's look at what the author claims they bewitched him to. It is a fact and a principle of Islam that associating saints, priests, rabbis, or even any Muslim scholar with God, next to God, or as an intermediary between believers and God, is a form of "Shirk" or the ultimate sin unforgiven of associating a partner with God. Where is the bewitching here? In the correct quotation of the Prophet:

"Verily people before you did take the graves of their Prophets and righteous as Mosques (places of worship), so don't you take graves as Mosques, I forbid you to do that."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
***Narrator:** Jandab Ibn Abduallah. **Reference:** Saheeh Muslim, **Number:** 532. **Degree:** Correct*

Not only is it that the concept and the quotations are correct throughout the 23 year tradition of the Prophet, but neither was there any bewitching in the quotation, nor was what the author claimed said on the Prophet's deathbed.

Then needlessly the author brings another fabrication about people gathering around the Prophet's bed forcing medicine into his mouth! Which is more untrue than it is irrelevant.

On page 166, commenting on the Prophet's most powerful command of the Arabic language, the author again mixes poison with honey when, in praising the briefness and powerful structure of the Holy Quran's phrases, indirectly claims that it is written by Muhammad (PBUH), since the topic is Muhammad (PBUH)'s language and obviously not the Holy Quran's!

A note from Moustafa Zayed:

There are two well-known, amazing features of the correct quotations of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH):

The first is that you cannot deliver the same meaning of his sentence with better expression or with a lesser amount of words. The second is that even though he had went through amazing tribulations, battles, victories, and experiences during his 23 years of Prophethood, all his correct quotations have the same structure and style that transcend time to the limit that you would think they were all said by the Prophet within the same day. Scholars attributed that to the revelation in the Holy Quran that his commands to the Muslims are not uttered by his own self but are the revelations revealed to him, so even though they were said over 23 years time, they were all from the same one eternal source.

Objective scholars of all kinds not only agree that the language of Muhammad (PBUH)'s quotations is totally different than that unique language of the Holy Quran, but also that the language of the Holy Quran is so powerful and rich with amazing multi-dimensional structures that it cannot be of a human source. I advise the author to start taking some basic Arabic classes that will greatly benefit him!

Commenting on the statement of the Prophet which we, again, had explained before, where one of the forms of protection and support

that God had given his Prophet and the believers in all the battles where the Muslims were overwhelmingly outnumbered, is that God struck fear of the Muslims in the hearts of the enemies of God, not to mention the angels that the Holy Quran stated had helped the believers of God in battles in several occasions. Was it the ratio of 3 to 1 in favor of Quraysh's army in the battle of Badr that had made the Muslims so scary? Or was it God granting His persecuted believers their first victory?

Was Khaybar the most fortified city in Arabia that had warriors behind its forts seven times the amount of Muslims, that what was terrorizing about the Muslims, or was it God striking fear in the hearts of the enemies of His Prophet, like He did with Moses, David, and many of his Prophets?

"You didn't kill them, but Allah killed them, and you have not thrown when you thrown, but it was Allah who threw, that He might reward the believers a good reward from Him. Verily, Allah is All-Hearer, All-Knower"

Holy Quran, Surat (Al Anfal) Ch (8), verse (17)

فَلَمْ تَقْتُلُوهُمْ وَلَٰكِنَّ اللَّهَ قَتَلَهُمْ ۚ وَمَا رَمَيْتَ إِذْ رَمَيْتَ وَلَٰكِنَّ اللَّهَ رَمَىٰ ۚ وَلِيُبْلِيَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ مِنْهُ بَلَاءً حَسَنًا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ (17

It's the author, again, just shoving the words, of terror, warriors, jihadists, etc. down our throats at any possible, relevant or irrelevant, occasion.

"After Muhammad"

The author made a statement on page 166, saying: "The Prophet of Islam left no clear successor; his fatal illness apparently came upon him too suddenly."

Even though Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) never ordered to make Abu Bakr his successor, and that is due to the obligation that God had ordered in the Holy Quran, and the Prophet himself had practiced and mandated throughout his Prophethood, which is "Shura" or Islamic democracy, in the Holy Quran:

"And those who responded to their God, establish prayers, their matter is consulted amongst themselves and spent for the cause of God from what We have blessed them with."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Shura) Ch. (42), verse (38)

وَالَّذِينَ اسْتَجَابُوا لِرَبِّهِمْ وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَأَمْرُهُمْ شُورَىٰ بَيْنَهُمْ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنفِقُونَ (38)

Yet there was a clear succession command known to most people. The first and most important indication to who would be the successor of the Prophet was whom the Prophet assigned to lead prayers when the Prophet was sick. In that case it was Abu Bakr, and that was the prophet's vote for Abu Bakr, who was mentioned in the Holy Quran:

"And a second of two as they were in the cave, as he said to his companion "Do not be sad, for Allah is with us." "
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Tawbah) Ch. (9), verse (40)

إِلَّا تَنصُرُوهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ إِذْ يَقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا ۖ فَأَنزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَأَيَّدَهُ بِجُنُودٍ لَّمْ تَرَوْهَا وَجَعَلَ كَلِمَةَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا السُّفْلَىٰ ۗ وَكَلِمَةُ اللَّهِ هِيَ الْعُلْيَا ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ (40

And even before the companions of the Prophet officially declared who the successor after the death of the Prophet was, you could tell that the successor of the successor would be none other than Omar Ibn Al-Khattab.

The successor was decided in the (Saqefat banu Saeeda) where leaders of the largest Muslim tribes gathered to decide who the leader of Islam would be. Some of which were legitimately hoping to have the successor be from their own tribe. The matter was consulted amongst all of them with a major influence from Omar Ibn Al-Khattab supporting none other than Abu Bakr. It is worth mentioning here that the leader of a major tribe of khazraj in Medina, Saad Ibn Obada thought that the successor should be one of the original leaders of the Medina tribes, since they provided the pivotal support and incubation of the seed of the new Muslim state in Medina from the beginning. Saad Ibn Oubada never gave allegiance to Abu Bakr or Omar Ibn Al-Khattab after him and declared his opposition in public, yet no one had ever oppressed him or affected any of his businesses or social dealings by the least.

On page 167, the author makes a weird supposition by presenting us with another untrue quotation. The author wrote:
"The one boy born to him, Ibrahim, whose mother was Muhammad's concubine Mariah the Copt, died at only 16 months old. The author wrote:
"If Ibrahim had lived, "Muhammad declared "I would have exempted every Copt from poll-tax" - that is, Jizyah.

Not only is the quotation untrue, evidenced at least by the fact that Copts of Egypt weren't obligated to pay any Jizyah for Egypt wasn't opened to Islam till after the death of Muhammad (PBUH) and Abu bakr, but think about it, was Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) saying that if I shall have a boy son from Mary the Copt, then I will exempt Copts from Jizyah? No. Ibrahim was already born and alive for 16 months as the author had mentioned. What was the Prophet waiting for to do that if the quotation was correct? Was he waiting for his son to be 17 months old or 17 years old? What was he waiting for according to the author's untrue quotation?

Is it a suggestion from the author that Muhammad (PBUH) wanted the successor of the leader of a Muslim state - as a rule - to be the son as if it is a royal system?

All of the "correct" quotations evidence state that the royal system of succession was resented by the Prophet. In his famous quotation, the Prophet said:

"There will be guided governing in my nation for thirty years, and then after it, there will be kingship."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Safinah Abu Abdelrahman. Reference: Al Saheeh Al Musnady, Number: 440. Degree: Good

Not only that the quotation is a clear statement against the royal succession system according to the Shura rule of Islam, but also it is one of the Prophet's predictions that always came true with pinpoint accuracy. Thirty years exactly after the passing of the Prophet, the feud between Ali Ibn Abi Talib and Mouaweya Ibn Abi Sufyan became a full-fledged conflict with significant bloodshed that had so many of the best companions killed, including Ali Ibn Abi Talib and the grandchildren of Muhammad (PBUH), Al Hassan and Al Hussein, themselves.

The author moves then to the issue of the supporters of Ali Ibn Abi Talib, who became the fourth caliphate, and totally confused the issue and the consequences of the death of Ali Ibn Abi Talib, with how Abu Bakr then, Omar Ibn Al-Khattab then, Osman Ibn Affan were appointed to lead the Muslims. There were no controversy as per if Ali Ibn Abi Talib was a contender to any of the three first caliphs. Immediately after the Reddah wars started - against Muslims who refused to pay the obligated charity tax (Zakah) - and after the passing of Fatima - the wife of Ali Ibn Abi Talib and daughter of Muhammad (PBUH) - Ali Ibn Abi Talib himself gave his allegiance to Abu Bakr, then to Omar Ibn Al-Khattab, and finally to Osman Ibn Affan, whom Ali succeeded as the fourth caliph.

The extremism and politicization of Ali Ibn Abi Talib and his two sons tragic deaths started to get rampant - through time - with false claims and inventions about not only, the fact that Ali Ibn Abi Talib was the rightful leader of the Muslims and not Muahwiyah which was true,

but also claims of Ali Ibn Abi Talib being the supposedly rightful immediate successor of Muhammad (PBUH) to begin with.
Even though the false claims were really sounded by some people even to date, but they were all results of the tragic death of Ali Ibn Abi Talib, Al Hassan and Al Hussein, yet they were never there before the tragedies. These false claims have even grown to the level of some of the Shiite factions elevating Ali Ibn Abi Talib to the status of the Prophet himself and some went to the absolute extreme of even saying that Ali should have been the Prophet, not Muhammad (PBUH)!
These are absolute minority factions, but they represent the level of extremism and false claims that this issue had caused.

The author on page 167 comments on Ayesha, denying that the Prophet had left a will that stated that Ali Ibn Abi Talib should be the successor of the Prophet. Not only is it that the Prophet would never impose a successor upon the people, where the Prophet specifically indicated that he would not make that a tradition for the leader of the Muslims to impose which successor should come after him, but also because everyone knew that it was Abu Bakr that the Prophet always appointed to lead prayers in the Prophet's absence.

On page 168, the author comments on the ideological conflict that has been erupting every now and then between the Shiite Muslims and the rest of the "Sunni" Muslims who make a majority of 90% of the Muslims worldwide. The author, who never ceases to amaze me, ends the chapter with a statement that has nothing to do with the conflict between the two parties, or any logical relevance whatsoever. On page 168 he wrote:
"It is a legacy entirely in keeping with the attitudes and behavior of the Prophet of Islam."!!!

Did Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)'s behavior and attitude encourage Muslims to fight amongst themselves, or was it always to unite and always do things in harmony and for the best interest of the nation?

Did Prophet Muhammad, (PBUH) preach to his followers to always fan the flames of their conflicts and keep it going for centuries? Or did he suggest to them that he will not impose his selection of his successor, yet he will just recommend someone leaving the ultimate decision to them to accept the suggestion or not?

I can only comment on the author's nugget of wisdom by saying it is a comment entirely in keeping with the attitudes and behavior of an Islam- fabricator!

"History makes it clear however that the legend of fanatical Muslims sweeping the world forcing Islam at the point of the sword upon conquered races is of the most fantastically absurd myths that historians have ever repeated"

Thomas Carlyle on Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), "Heroes and Heroines"

Chapter Ten

In the final chapter the author pushes the high lights of all his false allegations into the high gear of one chapter. A thousand fascism zeroes still are worth the same zero!

"The War on Terror"

With all the battles that the author narrated for us throughout nine chapters, can the author claim with all his unreliable sources, that Muhammad (PBUH) had declared jihad without the entire army of the Muslim nation and with every able-to-fight man participating?
In every battle it was the entire Muslim nation fighting, mostly defending their own existence, and if it was an outside war, then it was mainly against a foreign occupation army and not the locals themselves.
So to which reader was the author talking to when he said on page 169: "...with the September 11, 2001 jihad terror attacks"?

How could a bunch of guys that (only God knows who gave them the ability to plan such a sophisticated attack and, have NORAD step down from covering our North American airspace) be the entire army of Muslims or even that of the smallest Muslim nation?

An attack claimed to be done by an acclaimed terrorist organization that operates out of Afghani caves!

How could killing five hundred innocent Muslims amongst another twenty-five hundred innocent civilians victims of 9/11 even remotely be called an act of anything Islamic to begin with?

We have seen all the fabrications, crazy allegations, omitted and mistranslated verses throughout Mr. Spencer's book, so which verse of the Holy Quran or a quotation of the Prophet allows the killing of five

hundred innocent Muslims alongside twenty-five hundred innocent human beings?
You will not find an iota whether in the Holy Quran or the Quotations of the Prophet that substantiates the killing of one innocent soul, not to mention all the innocent victims of September 11th.

Where did the author find the audacity to claim that that criminal act be something that he says relevant to anything of the noble character of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), while he knows of all people that a corruption-on-Earth crime in Islamic law is punishable by execution in public to make an example of the criminals?
Was that because of whatever criminals associated with this abhorrent crime may have claimed, that they're Muslims or that they're doing this for Islam? Would that be the same justification that allows us to believe that God is responsible for the crimes that insane mass murderers commit, who usually claim that God told them so? Had Jim Jones survived his massacre, would our author demand that he be left to walk free if he claimed that God had told him so? The justification being that in Spencer land all insane mass murderers are credible and they never lie!

James Warren "Jim" Jones *(May 13, 1931 – November 18, 1978) was the founder and leader of the Peoples Temple, which is best known for the November 18, 1978 death of more than 900 Temple members in Jonestown, Guyana along with the deaths of nine other people at a nearby airstrip and in Georgetown, Guyana.*

Jones was born in Indiana and started the Temple in that state in the 1950s. Jones and the Temple later moved to California and both gained notoriety with the move of the Temple's headquarters to San Francisco in the mid-1970s.

The greatest single loss of American civilian life in a non-natural disaster until the events of September 11, 2001, the tragedy at Guyana also ranks among the largest mass suicides in history. One of those who

died at the nearby airstrip was Leo Ryan, who became the only Congressman murdered in the line of duty in the history of the United States.[1]

On pages 15 and 16, the author wrote:
"...And it is not my intention, to insult Muhammad (PBUH), to deride him, to lampoon or mock him, or to write anything except a scrupulously accurate account of what he said and did about some key issues."

And the next paragraph would cement the level of truthfulness of Mr. Spencer. Here is the next subtitle.

"Pedophile prophet?"

The author naturally would not miss the famous incident where in the most trusted source of the quotations of the Prophet - Saheeh Muslim - reported that Ayesha said:

"The Messenger of God married me when I was six; my marriage was consummated when I was nine."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Ayesha. Reference: Saheeh Muslim, Number: 1422. Degree: Correct

Regardless of the fact that the author tries his tired (poison / honey) mix again by saying that this was the norm at the time of the Prophet, and that nobody thought ill of it then, even when the Prophet was fifty years of age; the truth remains that to Muslims and to the status of the last Prophet of God, the issue is totally different. Here is why:

If the Prophet of God had thought that at his age of fifty marrying a nine year old was righteous in whatever set of circumstances at the time, then it is, and it is accepted by every Muslim, and the issue here would be the craziness of Mr. Spencer and his polite, well-mannered Mr. Vine thinking that their idea of right and wrong versus those of the last

Prophet of God himself, could possibly be of any worth or value to Muslims.

1. Having said that, let's use logic, science, and history, before my own conclusion about the matter can even be considered. The most important rule as to the age of marriage of females as per the majority of Muslim scholars is that the female had reached puberty and that she can mentally carry the responsibility of marriage. She has to be physically and mentally able to fulfill the duties of marriage. That combination varies dramatically from climate to another, from cities to rural areas and from generations to others. A very telling part of the Hadeeth is the question; why was the Prophet waiting to consummate the marriage for three years? The answer is simple; for Ayesha to reach the acceptable combination of conditions for her to be accepted as a wife.

2. The second and important question is: what was the criterion for the scholars, Muslim and Al-Bukhari to verify to us that piece of information?
The extremely difficult yet very simple criterion was that Ayesha did really make that statement. Here, the job of asserting the credibility of the quote as to Muslim and Al-Bukhari is completed, for she truly did say that. The most important question that many people are blind to, however, which is as simple and as clear as the sun, is; how did Ayesha know that she was nine at the time?!

3. Did Ayesha have her birth certificate in hand at the time? No. Was Ayesha looking at the calendar at the time? No. Was any one counting year after year watching her age, due to the need and importance of the info, maybe admission to kindergarten, vaccination table, or maybe, getting Ayesha an ID? No.

   The clear answer is that not only Ayesha was illiterate, did not know how to read, write, or calculate, but it was the middle of the seventh century, in one of the most rural areas of the planet at the time. So if Ayesha did not know the difference between nine and nineteen, and had no reference

for her birth date whatsoever, how could she possibly know which age she was at?

4. Let's look at what happens - scientifically proven- in reality, not in the middle of the seventh century, but even in the 21st century in rural areas! An interesting fact that in world soccer youth championships - under seventeen years and under nineteen years' competitions - are usually dominated by African teams. Why?
   The simple fact is that most of the African players are born in rural areas in Africa where there are no records of their birthdates whatsoever. The natural tendency is always to underestimate the ages of the children. So when these players are at the age of nineteen or even twenty-one, they think that they are under seventeen or eighteen years old, so when they meet more skillful European and Latin players, they have the overwhelming advantage of being three to five years older than their competitors at the time. So, they dominate. That advantage is totally washed away in regular men competitions, where being older by a few years is not an advantage since older players are also there on the other teams.

5. What many orientalists would not tell you is another piece of information in Sahih Al-Bukhari about Ayesha, who thought that she was six when she was engaged to the Prophet. The amazing piece of information is that she, at that supposed age, was formerly engaged to another man who was Jubair Ibn Muttaaem and then the engagement was broken! Which is virtually impossible, no matter what the author tries to allege that it is only an Islamic or Arab cultural thing. An example, on page 172, is when he sheds tears for Afghani girls where he wrote:
   "In early 2002, researchers in refugee camps in Afghanistan and Pakistan found half the girls married by age 13."
   Mr. Spencer always forgets that his beacon-of-light examples that he paints 1.6 billion Muslims all over 57 countries with, are usually limited to the most exceptional of places like, refugee camps in his favorite sandbox of Afghanistan and Pakistan.
   Refugee camps in non-other than rural areas of the 3rd poorest country in the world, where, the same natural practices, prevail in other rural areas

all over the world to date. Otherwise, why in a far, far away galaxy like the state of Alabama USA, the legal marriage age is only 14 years old! Last time I checked our good state of Alabama is not a war zone or occupied by a foreign country! And why not 1400 years ago but just 200 years ago the marriage age in the American state of Delaware was 12 years of age? I assure you not because they were crazy Jihadist Muslims!

6. Another scientific fact in reference to girls born in hot climates in the east, versus western girls born in cold climates, is that girls in hot climates reach puberty much sooner, sometimes five years earlier than those in cold climates.

7. Sociologists would tell you that maturity of boys and girls in rural areas happen much sooner than their peers in urban areas. The scarcity of people and the required additional manual activities teach responsibility at a much younger age.

8. Ayesha's marriage was 1400 years ago, where the life-expectancy of people was much less, almost by over twenty years than it is nowadays. Consequently, reaching puberty whether in the west or the east- at the time - happened naturally much sooner.

9. The conditions of allowing a girl to get married in Islam is not that extreme example of the minority Iranian Shiite practice that the author wanted to paint 90% of the Sunni Muslims with. The condition is that the girl has reached puberty and that she is mentally and physically capable of carrying the responsibility of a marriage and a family. All quotations and historical context prove beyond doubt that Ayesha did fulfill both conditions. Ayesha once said to the prophet who most of the night was praying and worshipping God:
   "I love to be near you, but I prefer what you yourself like to do, over it." Was that a little girl, or one of the wisest women you ever heard?

10. In the Prophet's famous quotation about sighting the moon to determine the beginning of the month of Ramadan:

"We are an illiterate nation, we do not know how to write or calculate . . ."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abdu Allah Ibn Omar. Reference: Saheeh Al Buckhary, Number: 1913. Degree: Correct

So without a doubt, Ayesha's estimate of her own age had to be erroneous. Yet using all these scientific, social, and historical facts, what would be the most likely correct estimate of her age? Would she be much older or younger than she thought she was?

11. Again, I reiterate, had Ayesha been truly nine, in the circumstances of that time, and Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) accepted her for marriage, then that is accepted by every single Muslim, no matter how many self-proclaimed righteous haters rant!

"Misogynist?"

Even though we have covered the issue of the multiple wives of the Prophet before, we will answer what the author had added to his final attacks at the Prophet in chapter ten.
He starts on page 172 with a fabricated story, when he said:
"Gabriel brought a kettle from which I ate"

By which the story claims that the Prophet said that he had supernatural power. And as we have said before, the Prophet had one wife - Khadija- that was fifteen years older than him in a marriage that lasted a quarter of a century, where he did not marry again till she passed away. The Prophet was only married to her for a complete ten years after he had already been revealed as the last Prophet of God. The fact that needs to be mentioned is that, that ten years of Prophet-hood where the Prophet had only one wife that was Khadija, were the same ten years during which he was ordered by God to invite to Islam in secret in the beginning, meaning that he could not publicly invite tribes to get into Islam and for that there was no need to marry into these tribes to forge peace and respect alliances. The other fact that we have mentioned several times but repetition is worthy here, is that the Prophet, even

before he was revealed to be the last Prophet of God at the age of forty, was never known to have fornicated or committed adultery, even by the fabricators of his time. He was not known to be the one who sought materialistic things and chased lusts, even when he was tempted by the leaders of Quraysh offering him whatever and whoever he wanted, just to give up inviting others to Islam.

On page 173, the author again interprets a famous verse in the Holy Quran in a way that is totally different from all the interpretations of the verse in any Islamic reference. In the Holy Quran (our translation):

"Your women are a tilth for you, so perform your tilth in whichever way you want to."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch (2), verse (223)

نِسَاؤُكُمْ حَرْثٌ لَكُمْ فَأْتُوا حَرْثَكُمْ أَنَّىٰ شِئْتُمْ ۖ وَقَدِّمُوا لِأَنفُسِكُمْ ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّكُم مُّلَاقُوهُ ۗ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ (223)

The verse addresses an incident when some of the companions of the Prophet asked him about a Jewish myth that if the intercourse happened in a certain position, the baby would be born cross-eyed. The verse later was revealed to indicate that as long as you're having natural intercourse with your wife, then you can have that intercourse in any position you want together. The verse never meant by any stretch of the imagination in 1400 years of Islam that a man can do to his wife whatever he wants. Mr. Spencer's interpretation is just that offensively absurd.

And as if the laughable fabrication crime that Mr. Spencer committed earlier in his book, where we exposed him was not enough, Mr. Spencer repeats verse 282 of Ch 2 (Al Baqara) again, where he claims that it pertains to witnessing rape crimes. This is after he omitted the first line of the verse that states that it is specifically for the matter of taking debts in a financial transaction! He adds, on page 173: "It declares that a woman's testimony is worth half that of a man."

The rules of witnessing in Islam vary according to the incident. What is really interesting is that the author never mentioned the verses

that specifically pertain to witnessing upon sexual deviance; the verses of "Leean" {Surat Al Noor (The Light), Ch.24 Verses 6 to 9)} where a wife's testimony is exactly equal to the husband. The author instead goes to the verse that specifically pertains to taking debts, omits that it is for taking debts, and then shed tears over the verse's inequality of witnessing rape incidents!!

In case of the taking debt verse, we explained that the purpose of two witnesses is solely for one to remind the other and that's why you don't have one man but two men and similarly you don't call one man a half a witness! So if there's no second man and no protection of women who would be forced to interact - to be able to be a witness - with men that may be foreign or forbidden for them to interact with, then that one man is replaced by two women, so they can independently remind each other as witnesses, while abiding by protection laws of Islam.
The author then jumps again to the similar issues that we covered sufficiently before, of marrying up to four wives or marrying more in the exceptional case of women war captives at the time. It is interesting when the author himself even brings verse number 3 in Surat Al-Nissaa (The Women), where God clearly states the ultimate reference for a man's decision to marry more than one wife, which is dealing fairly and justly with them and avoiding injustice.
In the Holy Quran (our translation):

"But if you fear that you will not be able to deal justly (amongst them), then marry only one, or that which your right hand possesses. That will be closer to preventing you from doing injustice."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nissaa) Ch (4), verse (3)

(3) ۚ فَإِنْ خِفْتُمْ أَلَّا تَعْدِلُوا فَوَاحِدَةً أَوْ مَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُكُمْ ۚ ذَٰلِكَ أَدْنَىٰ أَلَّا تَعُولُوا

Of course the sheer injustice of having multiple girlfriends, mistresses, one-night stands with no rights or respect given to those women while dealing with them sometimes as sexual door mats, is supposedly to the author more respectable than giving women rights as

wives, and respecting them and their legitimate children publicly in the Islamic system.

The author jumps again as if he is in a race to jam this page with as many accusations, unfounded or not, as possible by going to the inheritance issue, which we also covered before. Where, in one case of inheritance, the son inherits double the daughter, yet in the other thirty cases of inheritance, the female potentially inherits exactly like a male, and in three of them she inherits more. This is only with the caveat that according to Islamic law the father, then the brother, then the husband, then the son is always financially responsible for the female; at the same time, her inheritances are only hers.

Another jump to another mistranslation where the author quotes verse 34 in Surat Al-Nissaa - as usual - mutilating the first line that says (our translation):

"Men are to attend to women with what Allah had preferred one of them over the other and with what they spend of their monies (supporting them)"
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Nissaa) Ch (4), verse (34)

(34) ۚ الرِّجَالُ قَوَّامُونَ عَلَى النِّسَاءِ بِمَا فَضَّلَ اللَّهُ بَعْضَهُمْ عَلَىٰ بَعْضٍ وَبِمَا أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ أَمْوَالِهِمْ

The author, instead, made it as if men are in charge of women, and as if a wife is a piece of property, to the contrary of all what we have stated of correct quotations about the reverence of a mother and that the best of men in Islam are the best to their women, naturally the wives included; also, the issue of claiming that husbands are to beat their disobedient wives, which we have covered just in the past chapter. And as if all these crammed false accusations in just one page -173 - were not enough to have the intelligent reader appeal to Mr. Spencer to retire from any profession that has anything to do with credibility, the author adds another mistranslated quote of the Prophet just at the beginning of page 174:
"I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious, sensible man could be lead astray by some of you."

The translation is totally erroneous; the Prophet said:

"I have never seen ones that lack reason and religion that could make a man lose his mind than you."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Saeed Al Khidry. Reference: Saheeh Al Buckhary, Number: 304. Degree: Correct

The quotation means simply that a woman is more naturally guided by her emotions than reason: look at any mother and her relentless, limitless care and love for her babies above and beyond any logic, need, or personal comfort and try to explain that with cold logical reasoning. That emotional kindness is a mercy from God upon the human race in the form of our mothers. In addition, the fact that women, due to their monthly period and pregnancy, naturally have the license to pray and fast less than a similar aged man, which is a natural fact of being a woman, and consequently gives women less religious duty (but not lesser reward). What is more interesting is the second part of the same quotation, where the Prophet testifies to the intelligence and the skill of female ability to manipulate a cautious, sensible man, which in itself is praise.

And the final gem of wisdom comes when the author writes on page 174: "With statements like these from the Holy Quran and Muhammad, it is no wonder that women in Islam and in the Islamic world suffer such inequalities."

In chapter (8) we have covered an objective comparison between the rights of a Muslim woman in the Muslim world and that of many women in the west, however, I would like to add that with fabricated mistranslated verses and quotations like those the author crammed page 173 with, it is no wonder that women in the west are deceived into scarecrow narratives like that of Mr. Spencer, that they are blinded to the birth-given rights that God had afforded them in Islam.

"Draconian punishments?"

The author here addresses the issue of capital punishment in Islam, which we have also covered previously:
"Stoning for adultery and amputation for theft" are the two punishments that the author focuses on, on page 174. But he goes to describe them as "emblematic of its pre-medieval harshness and unsuitability for the contemporary world."

The author then brings up the issue of stoning as a punishment for adultery in the Torah, which we have also covered earlier:

When we proved that the order for stoning is in the Torah, evident by the famous tale in today's Gospel of John, when people gathered to stone a woman who committed adultery, and Jesus (PBUH) said that whoever was without a sin should cast the first stone at the woman. Hadn't it been a rule to stone as a punishment for adultery, why would Jesus try to persuade the people not to? Why, for example, did he not warn them that they are about to commit murder, unless stoning was the law in that case?

"If a man be found lying with a woman married to an husband, then they shall both of them die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shall you put away evil from Israel"
King james bible, Deuteronomy 22:22

Yet, in Islamic Law, it's not what was in the original Torah or not. The fact that the Prophet had ordered it and declared it as a rule in Islamic Law is more than enough for it to be such for all Muslims; in the Holy Quran:

"Whatever the Prophet had brought you, then take, and whatever he forbade you, then abstain from."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Hashr) Ch (59), verse (7)

(7) ۚ وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا ۚ

The conditions for prosecuting, and stoning married adulterers, however, are so difficult that it is more of a deterrent of such a crime than it is a capital punishment in itself. Evident by the historical fact that in the first 1000 years of Islam, stoning for committing adultery was applied only three times upon voluntary insistent confessions of the committers, and not due to catching adulterers in the act itself. The fact remains that it is - even though in reality more theoretical than practical - a part of Islamic Law for 1400 years and to date. How the rule is applied; justly or not, accurately or not, is a responsibility upon the shoulder of rulers applying the law and their integrity.

But in over a millennia of Islam, which I might add a closer millennia to successful application of Islamic Law than the second millennia, there was not one single case of executing a couple by stoning caught during the act of adultery.

How much knowledge do some Muslims have about Islamic Law and how accurately they may apply it in some tent village somewhere on planet Earth is irrelevant to the efficacy of the law itself.

On page 174, the author again resorts to:
"Islamic apologists in the West," whom he claims "like to point out that the Holy Quran does not contain this command."
Never mind if these specific apologists do exist or they are just a product of the author's imagination; they are the last to speak about Islam, not to mention defending it. For as per the cardinal rule of Islam represented by the verse we just quoted, correct quotations of the Prophet of what's allowed and what's forbidden are as obeyed as any command in the Holy Quran itself.
So when these "unnamed" apologists claim that the stoning rule does not exist because it's not in the Holy Quran, while it's repeatedly ordered by the Prophet in his correct quotations, they should be questioned first about having any minimal knowledge of the basics of Islamic Law to begin with, not to mention speaking or apologizing for Islam!

In the next paragraph, the author's comments truly represent the devastating ills of ignorant men creating man-made laws that have brought devastation to their societies, while so naively claiming civility and righteousness in fighting the laws of the Creator of all mankind.

On page 174, the author writes about the penalty of stoning for adultery, that it "can be mitigated. However, that hope is illusory."

Is adultery a good thing that the law of God inconceivably punishes harshly for?

How much do sexually-transmitted diseases cost every year the secularly-ruled countries that do not punish for adultery?
How many millions of lives lost to AIDS alone so far worldwide?
How many families were destroyed because of the irresponsible no-punishment of the "two consenting adults"?
How many children suffered the lack of one of their parents or both around them in their upbringing because of adultery? More importantly, look at the vast gap between the cost and the devastation of adultery in the West, versus their counterparts in Muslim countries even the poorest of them.

I want to ask pragmatically, practically and even from an absolute scientific secular standpoint: are these gigantic, devastating costs and ordeals worth three stonings by confession every 1000 years?

The author then brings the famous hadeeth of Omar Ibn Khattab, who reinforced the law of stoning married adulterers, where he mentioned a verse that was revealed to the Prophet, but then God ordered the Prophet after it was known to the companions to reveal the verse in Chapter 24, number 2 that describes the lashing of non-married couples. In many instances of revealing the Holy Quran, and to bring attention to certain laws for their importance and significance to the Prophets and the Muslims, God would reveal changes of position or additions to certain verses on a Muslims-need to basis and as the reminding occasion of the final form of the verse. A major example of that is when God revealed

the verse about the difference of reward between those who fought for the cause of God and those who had a legitimate excuse to stay behind. Then Ibn Oum Maktoum complained that he was blind and there was nothing that he could do to be able to join battle. That was the occasion where the verse was revealed that the same rule applies, except for those who are physically unable. Please note that both verses are valid and independently relate to each other.

The author then creates his own problem and then criticizes Islam for it! On page 175, he creates a new group called:
"Islamic reformers" and then states that:
"It is difficult, if not impossible, for Islamic reformers to make headway against this, when Omar specifically warns against them."

While "religion reformers" are more than a well-known term in political and Judeo-Christian religious factions, it is not a valid or a meaningful term according to Islamic Law.
Islamic Law in its principal is the collective commands in the Holy Quran and the commands of the Prophet himself, and not the collective man-made laws within a body overwhelmed with man-invented theology shaped by a certain environment of a certain age.
So when times change beyond the comprehension of these men, reform throughout Europe and later in America became an unstoppable necessity. Reform in Islam has always successfully been purifying the original laws of God and the commands of the Prophet from inventions and man-imposed errors, mainly due to unjust rulers' influence or that of corrupt and weak scholars; an effort that has mostly been honestly adhering to the well-known black and white Islamic Law fundamentals guided by a word of God that was never tampered with and the correct Quotations of the Prophet. So reform as an indication of a process of betterment does exist and, not to mention is actually mandated by Islamic Law, but by definition it is regaining the purity of the perfect laws of God - not altering or changing them according to Mr. Spencer's business ambitions - that endured all tests of time for the past 1400 years and where it was the primary reason of the constant thriving of the Muslim nation and expansion of Islam itself. At the same time, Islamic

reformers, as per the definition of the author, may be nothing but wolves of promoting secularism, in Islamic-activists' sheep's clothes.

The author comments on the capital punishment of theft, which in Islamic Law is cutting off the hand. While this law is within the context of the responsibility of the Muslim treasury of providing the poor with their sustenance no matter what the condition is, still, in cases of famine and the inability of the Muslim treasury to support and protect people from hunger the law is suspended. An example is in the case of the year of Ramadah (a year of famine), under the rule of Omar Ibn Al-Khattab when the rule was suspended. The severity of the punishment which has to be done in public is mainly a deterrent for people to commit theft than it is to punish.
The reaction to this law in some circles is a clear indication of how short-sighted and sometimes blind people are when they attempt to control societies and the ills of man through the limitations of their comprehension without ever being able to grasp the consequences of the big picture of society. In the Holy Quran:

"And in punishment there is life for you, O, you who comprehend, so that you may fear (God)."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch (2), verse (179)

وَلَكُمْ فِي الْقِصَاصِ حَيَاةٌ يَا أُولِي الْأَلْبَابِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَتَّقُونَ (179)

Watching the harsh capital punishments and even the knowledge of the existence of such potential punishments is the best crime-fighter and deterrent of future criminals. A time tested simple fact.
As per the US government, there are 6.6 million violent crimes committed in the US each year. It is objectively hard to claim that at least half of these crimes would have not been committed had there been a belief of the entire population that the Islamic punishment is there and is that severe.

When comparing the number of armed robberies that result in permanent injuries and loss of life to the victims as a percentage of the population to the similar ratio in a society like Saudi Arabia, the ratio is

vastly overwhelming in favor of the safety of the Saudi citizen.
And if you apply the ratio in a wealthy, diverse with foreign labor society like the society in Saudi Arabia to the number of violent crimes that are committed annually in the U.S, you would discover that millions of injuries and tragic deaths could have been prevented had Islamic Law been applied correctly in the U.S.
Amazingly and interestingly, if you look at the abstract statistics objectively and scientifically, Mr. Spencer and his likes are doing nothing but protecting thousands of violent criminals and thieves from punishment, at the expense of millions of injuries and deaths of their victims every single year!

Copying the author, at the end of the paragraph with his apparently nugget of sad words of wisdom, I will repeat the same words, only sincerely thanking God with his same words:
"the binding words of Allah, applicable then, now, and forever."!

"Warrior prophet?"

In this paragraph, the author lists the battles that the Prophet had participated in, and as usual confuses the fundamentals of forming any society with the overriding principal of peace in Islam.
The contradiction is really extreme. On page 178, he wrote:
"here again, Muhammad's example is normative."

*What better example should the Muslims take as reference than the last Prophet of God? Richard Nixon?!
According to the author's logic, every battle that the Prophet fought, most of which the Muslim army was severely outnumbered and fighting for their very existence, is somehow a sort of violence!

A cop is a police officer and a praised, valued member in any society and, if Muslim, he is someone who is "linked to violence"!!

A general or a soldier of a national army is a hero or a fallen hero if he is killed in battle, but if Muslim, they are jihadist warrior terrorists going crazy for killing and for buried treasures!

How practical is it for anytime in our modern time, that anyone of society be totally army-less and defenseless in the name of hypocritical peace?
How absurd is it if I ask the author to find one country that does not have an army, or even one small-sized city that does not have a police department?
Are the guns that police officers carry all over the world there to help commit violence or to protect the innocent from violence and keep peace?
How "normative" that rule is throughout the world; why would it be an oddity in the case of Muslims? God sends the Muslims and all mankind a perfect human example as a model of guidance to live by righteously in the real world. But instead, the author's argument is that, unless the preferred "normative" for the Muslims is to surrender your sovereignty and your natural resources to fictitious-wars crusaders; otherwise, the Muslim's religion cannot be called by the same crusaders a "religion of peace"?! How absurd.

Is the goal to deter Muslim countries from standing up for themselves against oppression, or otherwise they are stamped with the Jihadist crazed terrorist Spencer stamp? Or is it further scare the western population into oppressing the exponential peaceful growth in the west?

The author again invents false Islamic rules then accuses the Muslims of them! On page 178 he wrote:
"It is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain that Islam is a religion of peace where warfare and booty were among the chief preoccupations of the Prophet of Islam."

Not only is it that booty is a consequence of any war and never in any quotation of the Prophet or any verse of the Holy Quran was a prime target by any stretch of the imagination - otherwise the author would have fabricated a flying elephant conclusion about any hint of it if there was even a fabricated story about it - but war itself was an obligation upon the Prophet to defend the newly born Muslim state, or invite for the path of God and fight oppression by fighting tyrannical

systems around the Muslim state; all for the cause of God in order to bring justice to Muslims and non-Muslims. In the Holy Quran:

"And if they leaned towards peace, then lean towards it and rely upon Allah, for He is the most knowledgeable and the most listening."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Anfal) Ch (8), verse (61)

وَإِنْ جَنَحُوا لِلسَّلْمِ فَاجْنَحْ لَهَا وَتَوَكَّلْ عَلَى اللَّهِ ۚ إِنَّهُ هُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْعَلِيمُ (61)

"And fight for the sake of God those who fight you and do not transgress, for Allah does not like the transgressors."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Baqara) Ch (2), verse (190)

وَقَاتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا ۚ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْمُعْتَدِينَ (190)

In the second verse, not only is it forbidden to attack people for no reason, but even when you are allowed to fight whoever fought you first, it is that you do it only for the sake of God.

Fighting just for war and booty is the furthest thing from the cause of God. I ask the author again, how "truthful" is it of him to fabricate a false statement that "war and booty were among the chief preoccupations of the Prophet of Islam" in light of the above two verses that he - naturally - never quotes to his readers?

How did the author know a preoccupation of Muhammad (PBUH) that Muhammad, the Holy Quran, and all the Prophets' companions did not know about?!!

The author then on page 177 - being the wise man he is - advises his Islamic reformers as to how to retreat from "that Muhammad's example as an all ways normative."

I myself advise his Islamic reformers to work diligently with Mr. Spencer himself to convince him to stop fabricating Islamic rules and Islamophobia that have been, and are, causing horrible bloodshed of

Muslims around the world a thousand folds more than his beloved terrorist attacks ever did.

"Islamic tolerance?"

On page 177, the author subconsciously revealed a part of his prejudicial, racist, and fascist ideology. He wrote about the Muslims: "They have painted an ironic picture of Islam's respect for its sister "Abrahamic faiths" and thereby have given many Jews and Christians confidence that Western countries can accept Muslim immigrants in large numbers without any significant disruptions to their pluralistic societies."

In Mr. Spencer's fascist-land, people of all faiths, no faiths, and creeds from around the world can immigrate; only Muslims should be interrogated at the gate about their religious beliefs, otherwise they may disrupt Mr. Spencer's pluralistic societies! A South Korean or Northern Irish, a West Indian or a Zambian can immigrate to America, but only a Muslim may slip through the cracks if he was not questioned about his religious beliefs!
While the author is openly challenging the existence of Muslims in America and the west altogether, I wonder what hypocrisy may be about, if he in the next paragraphs, will try to critique the peaceful existence of Christians and Jews, freely and clearly worshipping according to their own religions in Muslim lands of the 7th century?!

Amongst the three Abrahamic religions, which one religion of them mandates the belief in all Prophets of God, the original scriptures given to these Prophets by God, and all the angels of God? Only Islam does so as a fundamental of the religion, 1400 years before America was blessed with the existence of Mr. Spencer himself.

I am not breaking any news that in Judaism, Jesus (PBUH) is an imposter and Virgin Mary - God Forbid - was a sinner, not a virgin, and in both Christianity and Judaism - contrary to what's in the original scriptures - Muhammad (PBUH) is not a Prophet of God.

The Muslim, who believes in all the Prophets and scriptures of God, however, should be the one kept at the gate of Spencer land!

In the following pages 177 and 178, the author severely contradicts himself after praising the West's pluralistic societies and provoking them against Muslim immigrants. He shows an uglier side of fascism when he lists a difference in ideology and criticism of Islam towards the deviated Christians and Jews.
As a laughable evidence of what he claims Islamic intolerance to be, how is an ideological Islamic criticism of the man-made deviance of some of the Jews and Christians which is no matter how you slice a difference in opinion - in the pluralistic, and free, democratic society of Mr. Spencer - be an evidence of intolerance, which is a practical behavioral crime? How could a difference of opinions and beliefs - in a democracy - automatically become a crime of intolerance?
It is really amazing that in a lecture of Mr. Spencer's, where he was defending the crusades of all topics! - that caused six million Muslim victims - where he had to stop and apologize for the first action the crusaders did after entering Jerusalem, when they went to the nearest synagogue, shut its doors and burned the innocent Jewish worshippers inside alive! What's more amazing than the inhumane crime the crusaders committed against the Jews, is also the comparison of Islamic tolerance of the same synagogue built in peace where Jews worshipped in freely under Muslim rule!
And we all, supposedly, should learn tolerance from Mr. Spencer who in addition of teaching us his crusader brand of tolerance, is the same one to also enlighten us as well about "the truth" about Muhammad!

On page 178, the author again mistranslates verse 51 in Chapter 5 (Al Maedah) (The Table) in the Holy Quran may be to try to push hatred between people. The author translated the word "Aouliaa" which in the context of the verse means "war or political allies", so in the case of battle, Islam forbids that Muslim nations get into alliance with non-Muslims, and again because of the special status that Christians and Jews have above all non-Muslims; the verse specifically said not to take even Christians and Jews as allies because they have more allegiance amongst

themselves than what they may have with the Muslims (read history). So from forbidding a nation taking another nation as an ally, the author changed the word "ally" to "friend" to force a political rule in a state of war between nations down to the personal level between just individuals! So no Muslim man can have a Christian or Jewish friend; I have laughed enough already.
Even using the translation of the author, which is erroneous at best, if Muslims did not have a tendency to have alliances with Jews and Christians, why would the verse specifically prohibit alliances with non-Muslims, even if they were Christians and Jews, if Muslims weren't naturally open to have allies with Christians and Jews? And why dance around the bush and concoct stories, mistranslations, and fabrications about what the verse would make Muslims do? Why wouldn't the author show us where Muslims may have committed a massacre in cold blood against Christians and Jews who lived in peace in Muslim lands? The answer to that question is, absolutely not. On the contrary go back to what the Crusaders, for example, did to Muslims and Jews under their rule.

Muslims know of the highly-revered position of Jesus (PBUH) in Islam. Muslims await not the coming of Muhammad (PBUH) at the end of time, but they actually await the coming of Jesus (PBUH) at the end of time, who will not only descend from Heaven, but will also kill the Anti-Christ and pray with the Muslims after destroying the forbidden things that people added and mutilated his message with centuries after he was ascended to heaven.

About the second coming of Jesus, the author writes on page 179 that: "He will return to end the dhimmi status of non-Muslims in Islamic societies, not by initiating a new era of equality and harmony, but by abolishing Christianity and imposing Islam upon everyone."

Not only is it that Muhammad (PBUH) never said that Jesus (PBUH) will impose anything upon anyone, but the quotations the author brought did not even mention imposing or forcing anyone to anything!

As a matter of fact, as per Muhammad (PBUH)'s famous quotation about the coming of Jesus (PBUH):

" I swear with whom my soul is in his hand, son of Maryam is about to descend amongst you a fair judge and a just leader breaking the cross, killing the pig, abolishing Jizyah, and money will overflow till no one will want it"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Hurayra. Reference: Musnad Ahmed, Number: 93/14. Degree: Correct

The only thing abolished in the quote is the Jizyah tax that the author made us swim in a river of his tears about throughout his book. The "dhimmi" status that will be canceled after the coming of Jesus (PBUH) is evidently due to the fact that his followers will not be called Christians anymore, for the true teachings of Jesus (PBUH) were his teachings as a mighty Prophet of Islam. So when Jesus declares his Islam, which was the case from the beginning, then Christians and Jews for that matter will become Muslim and will abandon drinking liquor and eating pork as a practice of some Jews and Christians. The author then, on page 180, writes:
"Combine this stripping away of all legitimacy from Judaism and Christianity with Muhammad's exhortations to fight against Jews and Christians, and it is no wonder that the Islamic world has been at odds with Jews and Christians through the centuries."

Where is that exhortation by the Prophet (PBUH) to fight against Jews and Christians? Can the author show us once one verse that says just that, or a correct Hadeeth that does the same? And if he will never bring any, then where did he come up with these claims and to what level of readers he thinks that these insane statements can ever make any sense? What legitimacy does the author talk about when the Christians follow Jesus (PBUH) teachings directly from him in the second coming? If Jesus (PBUH) declares that he is a Prophet of the One Mighty God - which he never declared otherwise in any true Gospel – and declares his Islam (Submission to the One Mighty God) which

Muslims believe was the case all along, then what the Muslims believe in is the true legitimacy of the true Jesus (PBUH) and his true teachings. The same thing goes for the Jews, for the one major issue that separates a Jew from a true Christian is that Jews do not believe that the historical Jesus, son of Mary, was the real Messiah they await his coming. So when he does come, and they're mandated in their own scriptures to follow him, then that actually bridges the gap that was there for over two thousand years so far, which will unite the true beliefs of Jews and Christians once and for all towards the worshipping of the one mighty God whom Jesus is His mighty Prophet.

Yet according to the author, that beautiful moment in the history of mankind, is when people would follow the true Prophets and their true teachings, and not the man-made theology that deviated their beliefs away from the true worshipping of the One Mighty God throughout history, and separated them into opposing factions among the one religion. That glorious moment when Jesus (PBUH) will spread light, peace, and justice throughout the world, where everyone is united in the true religion of worshipping the same one mighty God; that moment that is all led and initiated and powered by the descent of Jesus (PBUH) from heaven, can only be seen through the "hate anything Muslim" prism. That wonderful moment in the history of mankind the author calls a "stripping away of all legitimacy from Judaism and Christianity"!

As if the severe difference between Judaism and Christianity that is almost in a clashing opposition of ideologies is the legitimacy of the two religions! So when Jesus (PBUH) brings about the truth and ends the controversy forever, according to Mr. Spencer, Judaism and Christianity are not legitimate anymore.

The real interesting statement of the author is when he wrote: "No wonder that the Islamic world has been at odds with Jews and Christians through the centuries."

As per the Jews, we have demonstrated repeatedly that if it wasn't for Islam and its tolerance of Judaism and the protection that the

Muslims provided for the Jews to worship freely, there would have not been Judaism today. Christianity was even more protected by Islam. True Islamic history that the author does not quote states that even during the Crusades that resulted in the death of six million Muslims, and even though the Crusaders falsely declared that they were committing their abhorrent crimes in the name of Christ, there were no retaliatory acts of Muslims against native-born Christians in surrounding Muslim countries whatsoever.

The author then introduces a really interesting quote. He quotes a Saudi Sheikh by the name of Marzouq Al-Ghamdi. When the author said that Al-Ghamdi gave that quote four years ago, the long quote included that non-Muslims should not ride horses and that they should feed Muslims if they pass by their homes for three days and so many other things that there's no room to quote. And my question is; which society it is that four years ago still used horses for transportation?! At the same time, the rights and the laws that govern non-Muslim citizens in an Islamic society are already etched in stone by the Prophet, the Holy Quran, and centuries of unparalleled tolerance within any context you choose. Why would you go to a Saudi or non-Saudi individual and seek a controversial quote if you had any intention to really tell your readers the laws that are already clear in the Holy Quran, quotations of the Prophet, and 1400 years of history?

Was that Saudi sheikh declared four years ago the only human being that can decipher the complex codes of the Holy Quran that no one could comprehend, or the extra-terrestrial, unknown language of the Prophet, and for that we have to use that one opinion as our one and only universal reference?
Why is it that throughout Mr. Spencer's book are facts, not the absolute apparent truth and as clear as black and white, but always his hand-selected contemporaries who are quoted for their weird statements and bizarre opinions contradicting the same clear and apparent Islamic truth?

The author again tries desperately to find any trace of intolerance with Muhammad (PBUH) by pushing for the same lame conclusion that:

"We have already seen how insistent Muhammad was about the collection of the Jizyah."!

The statement is as ridiculous as claiming that all Muslims should pay taxes, but in the same Muslim society, non-Muslims should live tax free! Or as ridiculous as asking why the U.S. government is so insistent about collecting taxes!
The author repeats again the issue in verse 9:29 and quotes only the end of the verse. On page 181 he wrote:
"Meanwhile, the second-class status for Christians and Jews mandated by Holy Quran 9:29's stipulation that they "feel themselves subdued," was first fully articulated by Muhammad's lieutenant Omar during his caliphate (634-644)"

What the author failed to tell his readers is that those who are to "feel themselves subdued" are nothing but tax-evaders, where the verse tells the Prophet to collect the tax from non-Muslims even if they were Christians and Jews. And they should - when they are forced to pay what they cheated or evaded to pay - that they pay it when they are subdued, and previously we have commented on that that the IRS treats "first-class" citizens who cheat - never mind evade - on their taxes much worse than that.

Throughout my book I didn't have the room to even make comparisons between Islamic laws and similar conditions in the surrounding real world at the time, or display facts in the objective light of "compared to what."
I always displayed Islamic law in the absoluteness of it that transcended time and place, regardless of the ease to compare it to the others.
One historical fact that comes to mind is that the Roman Empire - that was Christian at the time - imposed over 14 different kinds of taxes upon Christian Egyptians! Feeling "humiliated" when caught by the Romans cheating on taxes was a dream compared to what happened to the Egyptian that got caught evading taxes!

Another issue that the author quoted the Saudi Sheikh for is that non-Muslims should not wear the distinctive attires of Muslims, which was true yet it wasn't a matter of classes. The matter was that non-Muslims were not to participate in the Muslim army, where the official army-attire was the traditional Muslim man-attire, so not to have confusion in battles about who is a Muslim soldier and who is a non-Muslim civilian.

On pages 181 and 182 the author brings a corrupt document about the status of non-Muslims in a Muslim society. Even though the author claimed that it was an imposed order from Omar, the great companion of the Prophet and the great second caliph after Prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

The language of the document the author quoted is amazingly a statement or a pledge made by non-Muslims and not an order by the Caliph or the Muslims themselves!

The real Caliph Omar document however, which is known by the "Omarian document," is etched in stone to date in Jerusalem, was offered to the non-Muslims of Jerusalem when the whole city surrendered peacefully to the rule of Muslims, insisting by its leaders that they would only surrender it to the great Caliph Omar in person: It states is as follows:

"This is what the servant of Allah, Omar, the Caliph of believers, had given the people of Illia (Jerusalem) of security, he gives them safety of themselves, monies, churches, crosses, its ill and healthy and its entire denominations. That their churches will not be used for housing, that they will not be destroyed, that nothing is taken from them, or their monies, that they are not forced against their religion, and that none of them is harmed. That Jews are not forced to live with them, and that they pay Jizyah as much as the swelters of cities pay and that they are obligated to exile thieves and Romans out. Whoever chooses to move to another town then he and his monies are safe till he reaches his destination and whoever decides to stay then he is obligated to pay his Jizyah…"

Omar, of all people, is the great Caliph who, when he was visiting Christian leaders in one of the largest churches in Jerusalem (Church of Qyama) and noon prayer was called, refused to pray inside the Church and left to pray outside, stating that he did not want any man to come after him and claim the Church as a mosque for the Muslims with the excuse that Omar was seen praying there.

On page 182, and after commenting on an apostasy case of a Kuwaiti citizen in 1990, the author resorts again to his rock-solid statements about the illusionary things that only he can see.

He said:

"It is nothing short of staggering that the myth of Islamic tolerance could have gained such currency in the teeth of Muhammad 's open contempt and hatred for Jews and Christians, incitements of violence against them, and calls that they be converted or subjugated."

!! Hello!!

I thought that this book was about the truth of Muhammad?

It is Muhammad (PBUH) who had said that:

"Whoever killed a Zemmey will never smell Paradise"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abdu Allah Ibn Amro Ibn Alas. Reference: Saheeh Al Buckhary, Number: 3166. Degree: Correct

Is he the same Muhammad (PBUH) that the author had just talked about, or does the word "truth" nowadays mean "illusions"?

Where is that piece of truth that the Holy Quran, correct quotations of the Prophet, and all scholars of Islam have missed in the past 1400 years, and where did Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) openly incite violence ever against any innocent non-Muslim?

Where does Muhammad (PBUH) say 'convert,' or 'be subjugated'? Was it ever said that if you become a Muslim, you're not paying any tax, and when you remain a non-Muslim, you're forced to

pay Jizyah tax?!! Can a hundred dollars a year per family be considered subjugation to any American minority community? Or did the author mean to say cheat, don't pay taxes, otherwise if you pay taxes to your Muslim government you're a second-class citizen?

Here is a repeat for history's leading thinker/orientalist quotes about the subject for the second time!

"We have not heard that - under the rule of Islam - about any predetermined attempt to force non Muslim factions to convert to Islam, or about any deliberate organized oppression to eradicate the Christian faith. If any of the Caliphs chose to execute any of the two plans they would have crushed Christianity with the ease that Ferdinand and Isabella eradicated the religion of Islam from Spain, that made Louis XIV ordained that the protestant faith followers punishable in France or like the way that Jews were exiled of Britain for 350 years"
John Taylor Caroline (1753-1824) the American political Philosopher (Republican Jeffersonian)

"The eastern churches in Asia were already separated from the rest of the Christian world which was not to support them in any way considering them infidels of the religion. Therefore the sheer existence of theses churches today is in itself a strong evidence of the general tolerance of Islamic governments towards them"
Sir Thomas Walker Arnold, the most renowned Orientalist in history

The author throws again one of his nuggets of delusion, stating, on page 182: "And Muslims can, of course, act as tolerantly as anyone else, the example of Muhammad, the highest model of human behavior, constantly pulls them in a different direction."!

It is a blessing of God for any Muslim to be pulled constantly in the direction of the last Prophet of God. The man, who forgave his enemies, set them free, wished them well, and prayed to God to forgive them, and not just one enemy, but he forgave an entire city of them. With our author himself, who's up to this point clearly and definitely clinically senile of what he wrote in the previous chapters, when the Prophet let an

assassin who sneaked upon him to kill him, walk free, when he forgave the leader of the plotters and the hypocrites against Islam, wrapped his body with his own shirt when he passed away, laid him in his grave himself, and supplicated to God to forgive him, and the same man that the author himself stated that the ultimate punishment he gave one who committed apostasy and joined the enemies army, was nothing but to let him walk free, him and his brother who committed the same crime. Would I want to be pulled towards the example of that man? I pray to God, absolutely yes, please have me swept all the way in that direction.

The author, at the end, complains that the Western analysts oversee his delusional conclusions and accuse them of believing what they wish to believe: that Islam is a religion of peace and that the Prophet is the Prophet of tolerance. Here's the joke. Are you ready?
Robert Spencer is claiming that:
"People can be convinced of something they wish to believe, regardless of overwhelming evidence to the contrary."
I can only comment by the famous Arabic adage that we quoted before:
"She accused me of her own ills, and then escaped."

"A kinder, gentler Muhammad"

The author here brings a whiff of objectivity when he now quotes some of the correct quotations and descriptions of the Prophet; that won't last long though. We will bring the quotations without comment.
On page 183, "The one whose "heart was filled with intense love for all humankind irrespective of caste, creed, or color" "

"The one who had "the opportunity to strike back at those who attacked him, but refrained from doing so" "

"One of his companions described him as "neither rough nor harsh. He is neither noisy in the markets nor returns evil for evil, but he forgives and pardons." "

"He "was not a reviler or a curser nor obscene." "

The author then brought the quotation of Anas ibn Malik, who served the Prophet for ten years, saying (our translation):

"So I served the Prophet for ten years; he had never said to me for anything I did: why did you do that, or for anything I didn't do: why didn't you do that?"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Anas Ibn Malik. Reference: Ibn Taymyah's dare Altaroud, Number: 420/8. Degree: Correct

That surprise of the rare incident of the author bringing more than one correct quote within one page ends quickly when he, between the quotes, brings an irrelevant incident of an American professor who founded what is called the "Student's Islamic Movement of India" (SIMI), which the author claims was implicated in the Mumbai bombings of July 2006. The author quotes the professor, wondering as to how that some members of that movement could commit such crime of violence against innocent civilians in the name of Islam.

The amazing fascism logic, which allows you to punish people by stretching suspicion to an extreme of conviction without any evidence, is really apparent here: what is the innocent professor to do with the behavior of totally different human beings living in another continent?
Who in their right mind can even dare to claim that if I found any social organization, then every member would automatically become a human angel, and if one of them commits a crime on his own for whatever reason, then amazingly somehow that professor should be implicated?!
As a matter of fact, one of the most laughable, yet saddening expressions that is always repeated when any Muslim man or woman is harassed or falsely arrested without evidence lately, is the expression that he or she is "linked" to whatever claimed terrorist organization du jour!
Most of the time, that "linked to" accusation is as strongly supported by evidence as my genetic relationship to Elvis Presley!

The courts' garbage cans are where most of these cases wind up.
The author then does not surprise us when he, on his own, decides that the myriad of forgiveness and merciful actions of the Prophets and the testimony of all his companions were nothing but a "magnetism" and "charm" tricks that he must have used to gather all these people around him! Even worse, the author brings a well-known quote that does not surprise any Muslim, yet it is surprising that Mr. Spencer himself would bring it, which is the correct quote of the incident. When the Prophet stood up in respect to the passing of a funeral, and when one of his companions indicated to the Prophet that the deceased was not a Muslim but a Jewish man, the Prophet of all mankind answered, "Was he not a human being or did he not have a soul?"

The amazing comment on that apparent noble mannerism of the Prophet is when the author claimed that it must've been in the early days when the Prophet wanted to invite Jews to Islam!!

Was the Jewish man raised from the dead to become a Muslim? Not to mention that the quote that the author brought states that the Prophet was surrounded by companions that were all Muslims. So were the Muslims actually Jews, and the Prophet was trying to convert them to Islam?!

On page 184, the author moves to another incident, when Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) stated what he had stated throughout his hadeeth and what God had revealed in the Holy Quran, that the only religion accepted by God is Islam, which in itself is a purification of the true teachings of the Prophets of Christianly and Judaism enhanced by the additional laws that God had revealed to all mankind through his last Prophet. The author quotes the incident of another passing away of a Jew when he wrote:
"A Muslim recounts that, "The bier of a Jew passed before the messenger of and (the members of the family) were wailing over him. Upon this he said: you are wailing and he is being punished."

In many historical incidents of which we have mentioned several of them in this book, Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) displayed an ability given to him by God to tell the fate of certain people on Judgment day, including a brave soldier in his army who the Prophet said he was destined to hell fire, for the companions to witness the man committing suicide later in the battle. When the Prophet tells of the fate of another man Muslim or non-Muslim, it can only mean simply that it is that specific man's fate. Yet if it is Mr. Spencer who is narrating the story, the conclusion has to be that it is only because the man is a Jew!
Did Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) say that? No.
Is it entirely a baseless wild guess of Mr. Spencer? Yes. Yet the book is "the truth about Muhammad"!

What the author also did not mention is that wailing over the deceased or screaming is forbidden in Islam.
The author then claims that his so-called Muslim apologists - when they speak about the mercy and the forgiveness of the Prophet - don't mention his battles and raids against the infidels.
So when it is upon the Prophet to fight evil and oppression, he fought it, sacrificing his life for the cause of God like no man ever fought. And when it was the normal day to day life, he was the most merciful, forgiving, gentlest, man that people had ever seen. When the author confuses the most vicious of infidels that were out there to destroy the religion of God, with just political opponents or some sort of ideological opposition, then it's not the apologists who are not telling the whole story, but it is Mr. Spencer who is insistently resisting any hint of understanding it, worse, accepting its reality!

What I think is that most of the readers with any common sense do understand is the perfectness of the character of the Prophet as an example to all mankind in the real life of dealing with both sides of the spectrum of life; Good and evil.

Even in his previous comment, the author wonders about what he calls the conflict between Muslims, Christians, and Jews throughout the centuries. Christian/Christian wars in central Europe that victimized

10 million according to some estimates (French Voltaire is one), not to mention that France and England pillaged Muslim countries for centuries, yet you would think reading the books of Mr. Spencer and his likes, that it is the Iraqis who are occupying America and the Afghanis occupying England and the Palestinians are wreaking havoc upon German Zionists in Europe. Maybe recently it is a true conflict, but it is a conflict of oppression, where Muslims in their own homelands are plain victims all the time, and by the millions.

"The veneration of Muhammad"

Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) himself, when he was asked about the purpose of God sending him with His message to all mankind, answered:

"I was sent but to complete the most noble of manners."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Abu Hurayrah. Reference: Al selsilah Al Saheha, Number: 45. Degree: Correct

"And you are but with great manners."
Holy Quran, Surat (Al Qalam) (The Pen) Ch. (68), verse (4)

وَإِنَّكَ لَعَلَىٰ خُلُقٍ عَظِيمٍ (4)

The entire religion of Islam as defined by the Prophet of Islam himself - and not extreme nameless commentator's millennia later - is about nothing but noble behavior and manners.
God Himself in the Holy Quran made the ultimate reference of that noble mannerism pursuit of the Prophet of God in the above mentioned verse.
For Muslims then to follow the mannerism, the ethics and the character quality of the Prophet of God is in itself a blessing of not only achieving the highest level that satisfies one's hope of an accepted stance before God, but more so achieving that according to the precise record and the clear reference of the Prophet himself.
For specifically, that reason and to the benefit of all mankind, it is no coincidence that the most accurately quoted man in history is Prophet

Muhammad (PBUH), not to mention that he's the most biographed man in history as well. Having said that, it is he who said:

"Do not praise me like the Christians praised Eissa son of Maryam but say (call me) a servant of Allah and his messenger"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Omar Ibn Alkhatab. Reference: Ghayat Al Muram, Number: 123. Degree: Correct

It is him who made sure to always eat on the floor like servants, and used to help his wives in their house chores, including cooking, milking the sheep, sewing his garb and serving himself.

It was him who forbade his companions, who loved him more than they loved themselves, from ever standing for him when he walked in, and it was also him who could never have been identified as the last Prophet of God by any hint of arrogance or posture in the way he sat amongst his companions. If you did not know him, you would have had to ask about what he looked like, for you could never tell his status by his modest behavior.

One famous incident is the incident of the insemination of the palm trees in Medina.

The Prophet was walking in Medina and he saw some men inseminating palm trees; the Prophet said to them, "**Maybe this is not the right thing to do.**" Which was a suggestion by the Prophet, yet the result was that the palm trees that were not inseminated did not bring fruit the following season, and then the people came to the Prophet inquiring about that negative outcome.

The Prophet explained to them that what he meant was a thought that could have gone either way, and that they are more knowledgeable about the matters of their business and their world. The Prophet added:

"But if I told something about Allah then take it, for I never lie about the account of Allah; all praises and greatness to Him"
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Talha Ibn Obaid Allah. Reference: Saheeh Muslim, Number: 2361. Degree: Correct

This incident is of great significance in Islamic Law and the religion itself.

Firstly, is that the Prophet (as in many other occasions and in his general behavior that supported Shura (Islamic democracy of consulting), that always opened the door for people with knowledge to decide upon their matters of life, in the sense that Islam provides the general solid structure of long-term stability and protection to Muslims' God-given rights? Yet, within the same structure, it is the Muslims themselves who have to manage, compromise, decide in whichever way they want to pursue their happiness within the guidelines of that Islamic Law structure; as the matter of fact one of the definitions of Islamic jurisprudence (Fiqh) is that it is the comprehension of reality. There is no rigidity in Islamic Law.

The second is that in pursuing the do's and don'ts of the religion itself, where the "Sunnah" or the tradition of the Prophet is a key component as equal and as important as the commands of Allah in the Holy Quran, yet "Sunnah" is not copying every single thing that the Prophet had done. The Prophet clearly stated that his sunnah is what he said to do, and what he said not to do, his behavior about doing the same things in question and agreeing or disagreeing with things, whether verbally or by gesture. However, the absolute personal preferences of the Prophet when he never said, you have to do this or you shouldn't do this, like his personal preferences of food, clothes, pattern of travel, etc. are not a part of the Sunnah of Islamic law; and when you go as far as emulating these non-mandated by the Prophet preferences, it becomes an individual choice and preference of you as a Muslim, but not a mandated law.
An example is that the local custom at the time was that many men did

braid their hair. That was the manly look of the time. Yet, while Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) ordered Muslim men to grow their beards, but he never said or ordered Muslim men to braid their hair. The beard is a universal part of sunnah for every Muslim man, while the second part was a local custom that changes, where the only preference to that is that a man should look like what a man should look like during the time or within the culture he lives in - unless it violates a clear forbidden matter - and the same for women. Another example is that the Prophet - for example - preferred to eat squash and it was one of his preferred foods. You will not find Muslim scholars today of any worth that would tell you it is mandated that every Muslim should eat so much squash, as if it is a part of the tradition of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) or his manners.

To the contrary, and out of a huge volume of work of the respected Muslim scholar Abu Hamed Al-Ghazali, where he, on his own, according to his own comprehension, was so fond of the Prophet when he said, what the author quoted on page 185:
"The key to happiness is to follow the Sunnah and to imitate the messenger of God in all his coming and going, his movements and rest, in his way of eating, his attitude, his sleep, and his talk."

That statement is simply a personal preference and opinion of a Muslim scholar that is only substantiated by his own perceptions and preferences to achieve religious happiness. And as we have stated before, a cardinal jurisprudence rule of Islam is that "the comprehension of men is not a revelation of God."

How would that personal preference of Al-Ghazali about what happiness is be a mandate upon Muslims, if Muhammad (PBUH) himself did not mandate it upon Muslims that way?
Please note also, it is so clear that Al Ghazali was speaking about his own personal preferences.

Can the author differentiate between personal choice and perception of one man or a group of men versus the generality of Islamic Law and its rights/obligations upon all Muslims?

Having said that, even doing it like the scholar Al-Ghazali has preferred is not wrong according to Islamic Law, yet the accuracy of the law and the civil rights of people clearly differentiate between what you are obligated to do and what preferences you may have according to your own liking.

The author, instead of discussing what true scholars of Islam have said about taking the great manners of the Prophet as an example, or what the Prophet himself has said about it, he as usual resorts to the most extreme of minorities of which some are not even Muslim to begin with, like when he wrote on page 185:
"Likewise, a modern Arab writer opined that Allah "created Muhammad 's body in such unsurpassable beauty as had neither before him or after him been seen in a human being." "

That Arab writer that the author hand-picked to quote - Annemarie Schimmel - not only is not a Muslim, nor an Arab, but is a respected German orientalist, not to mention that her opinion is not supported by the Holy Quran, the quotation of the Prophet himself nor any majority of Muslim scholars. That however, is irrelevant of the fact that Schimmel might have thought she was praising the Prophet.

According to Islamic Law, the physical looks and appearances of the Prophet are of absolutely no importance to the manners of the Prophet or the religion itself. Even depicting a picture or a statue of the Prophet is totally forbidden, by none other than the Prophet himself! Another source of how extreme and unreliable the sources of the author are, is again not a major scholar of Islam, not a quotation of the Prophet himself, not a part of the Seerah of the Prophet, nor the Holy Quran itself, but a Persian Sufi mystic poet, Mansoor Al-Hallaj, who of all people, was overwhelmingly accused of blasphemy by the scholars of his time, including not just Sunni but Sufi ones, and was convicted as such!

The author quotes him, when he wrote on page 185: "Perhaps reasoning from his study of the Holy Quran, said that Allah

"has not created anything that is dearer to him than Muhammad and his family." "

There is nothing in the correct quotations of neither the Prophet nor the Holy Quran itself that pertains to that quote, specifically in regards to Muhammad's family. The status of the family of Muhammad (PBUH) is revered to all Muslims and its repeated in every prayer that Muslims pray for Allah's Praise of Muhammad (PBUH) and his family, but how dear or not dear that family is to Allah is just a speculation that was rampant to date in the minority of Sufi mysticism and Shiite Muslims, who are in many ways factions that sometimes commit grave sins; similar to the ideology of raising saints to the status of the Prophets of God in some factions of Christianity, and sometimes even supplicating and praising them as much.

Why resort to mysticism in minority Sufism? Even to the one who died accused of an extremely rare conviction of blasphemy? Then why you want to go as far as "perhaps reasoning from his study of the Holy Quran," if it is in the Holy Quran itself, then show it to us, and if not, then, why travel to the outer space of mysticism if you are telling your readers any "truth" about Muhammad on earth?

The answer is, because the clear truth of the manners of Muhammad (PBUH) - which is at hand in his clear correct quotations, biography, and the Holy Quran - is to the opposite of the narrative of Mr. Spencer that can only be supported by "the perhaps reasoning" of extreme blaspheming Sufi mystics!

"Imitating Muhammad today"

On page 186, the author makes a statement that I do not know if was meant to be the joke it is or not; however, regardless of his intention, it is really laughable. He wrote:
"When Muslims look to imitate him, they look to the same sources I have used in this book: the Holy Quran, the Hadeeth, and the Seerah."!!

Really?! In the last page, when quoting Islam and Muslims about the exemplary model of the manners of the Prophet and how to follow them for individual Muslims, the author did not quote one verse from the Holy Quran, one quotation of the Prophet, correct or not, nor anything that has anything to do with the Seerah, which is the biography of the Prophet. As a matter of fact, the closest - time wise - reference to the Prophet was a quote from a Persian, Sufi, mystic Mansoor Al-Hallaj, who lived four centuries after the Prophet and died accused and unanimously convicted of blasphemy!

Does the author think that his readers have the memory of a fly, or maybe that they take long vacations every other page? Not to mention that throughout his book, none of some of the major references of Seerah and Holy Quran interpretations were ever used even once. And the overwhelming reference that the author relies upon is the most corrupt, unverified, and unfiltered source of the biography of the Prophet, which is Ibn Ishaq: where the author almost exclusively quoted only the well-known, proven fabrications of them.

On the following pages, from page 186 all the way to page 190 and building on the joke that the author claimed Muslims used as a reference for their emulation to the manners of their great Prophet, the author brings several cases of quotes, incidents of some Muslims that of course are hand-picked by him as if it is the consensus of 1.6 billion Muslims. Naturally, I would challenge the author in any allegations that he has against Islam and Muslims. But I would not dignify generalizing, out of context quotes of individual deviation cases, with a discussion or a comment as if it is any indication or any representation of Islamic Law or the manners of the Prophet.
For every case, every quote, and every individual action that the author may quote, even if they were by the thousands, I or anyone else can bring a thousand times worse and more horrendous actions and crimes - never mind quotes - that belong to the fascist-right for whom which Mr. Spencer is proudly its mouthpiece. And if terror is so abhorring in Islam and considered a corruption-on-Earth crime, which is described in Islamic Law as "terrorizing safe people" - where people here means all

people of any kind for that matter - then, if the author exhorting us in his crusade against terrorists, the least honorable and objective pursuit should be standing against those who terrorize, kill and torture the innocent using fictitious wars, awkwardly empty slogans, to afflict massive terrorism upon entire Muslim nations and not just individuals. Or is it that the entire demonize-Muslims, Jihadist warriors campaign the needed justification to commit real abhorring state terrorism?

When the author finds us that one Muslim country, that just for fictitious reasons, have invaded and occupied a non-Muslim country, killing its civilians whether directly or indirectly by the hundreds of thousands, then let's hear his laughable theories about jihad, Mystics, illusionary traditions, and warrior terrorists. When terror is imposed on a daily basis upon the innocent civilian population of Palestinians, Iraqis, Afghanis, with a total of millions displaced out of their homes, hundreds of thousands killed, natural resources and infrastructure destroyed or pillaged, then I would dignify his examples with an answer.

On page 190, the author comments by writing:
"Most western governments and law enforcement officials would dismiss all this and similar examples and others as manifestations of the twisting or hijacking of Islam. But we have seen that all the words and deeds of Muhammad, which the jihadists prefer are amply attested in early Islamic traditions. Nor is there a wealth of material in those traditions offering a radically different view of Muhammad"

As we have commented on this previously, the author comes again, beating the same dead horse. The fact is, in America, there are charitable organizations that spend billions of dollars in alleviating pain and suffering of poor people around the world in a gigantic practical act of mercy - America is the most charitable nation in the world - in itself these wonderful efforts by the American people do not make a radical difference or a dual personality of America, when also it is the biggest nation in spending on arming local police departments and on jails in the world. A perfect example is when a person fights with every strength that

he has when fighting is a must, but when the circumstances are the norm of life then expressing and acting as merciful, as forgiving and giving as much as he can. The example of Muhammad (PBUH) sacrificing himself for the cause of God against oppression and against the infidels who, through force and tyranny, wanted to destroy the righteous and the path of God, is actually more noble than any act of charity itself, for when you do that - protecting the innocent who cannot protect themselves - you are sacrificing the most valuable thing you have: your life, as charity for their well being. And in America we don't call them falling heroes for nothing.

Yet the author refuses and blinds himself to see the difference between a state of war and a state of peace, which every nation and every individual goes through in life, with different reactions and ever changing priorities.

A police officer, a fire fighter or a soldier is the hero of any society, but if they were Muslims; to Mr. Spencer they are all connected to violence!

In the end of this section, the author makes a statement that, in my opinion, should have had him sued by not only every Muslim organization in America, but by any civil rights organization that is true to its message. On pages 190 and 191, the author wrote:
"Such officials often placed themselves in the peculiar position in maintaining that Muslim supporters of terror are only a tiny minority, but acknowledging at the same time that this tiny minority controls the leadership of virtually every significant Muslim body, and evidently the vast majority that rejects jihad, violence can do nothing to dislodge them from these positions of power"

Very few fascists and totalitarian systems would dare to have the absurdly stupid word of "every" added to such a naïve, awkward accusation, and I repeat, Mr. Spencer, our objective truth-seeker- who claims that he somewhat represents the best interest of not only the American people, but the west in general - has just alleged that virtually every significant Muslim body is ruled by "supporters of terror"!

In fascist Spencer-land, only he does know their intentions all, know them all, accuse them all, judge them all, and by an allegation like terror, demand to get rid of them all.

Mr. Spencer has to be paid very well for his relentless efforts in framing the leaders of 1.6 billion people into his demonized terrorists sham, yet an allegation like this against a minority population of Muslims in a society like America today, makes him unfortunate of not being born when an employer like Hitler would have paid him much more handsomely for the same efforts!

"Frightening reality"

The real, frightening reality is allowing the history of evil to repeat itself just under a different label using the same excuses and the same declared goal of hurting the innocent by suspicion or for whatever religion, race, and association they may have.

It is frightening that people forget that when Hitler wreaked havoc on earth, causing tens of millions of deaths, he never said, I am a fascist-crazy dictator who has the least regard for any human decency. Hitler ranted about Germany defending itself against its enemies and against conspiracies targeting the Germans from every direction.

The atrocities that he committed in the name of God, country, and attacking the enemies of Germany before they attacked Germany will always be indication of the same consequences Mr. Spencer is happily a first-in-line mouthpiece for.

The fascist and blatant goal in open daylight to discriminate, oppress, crush Muslims, their beliefs and their ideology of right and wrong into a tenth class world citizens is openly disclosed throughout Mr. Spencer's writings, this book, and specifically in its last pages.

We have made it so clear with true evidence by history, and testable evidence that the entire horrible image that the author imposes upon every Muslim and upon the last Prophet of God is an outright pitiful

fabrication, mutilation and omission of the facts. Yet, regardless, the western democracy which Mr. Spencer describes by "a pluralistic society by definition" in itself prohibits the persecution of a group of people's ideology or difference of opinion. Yet, in a fascist society and ideology that Mr. Spencer clearly subscribes to, all you have to do is find a criminal or a group of crimes and vaguely impose an association between those crimes and that entire population you want to persecute, or worse, eliminate, and there goes any God-given or even civil right that that population might have.

The belief in Islam, God, and the last Prophet of God, regardless of what Mr. Spencer and his likes believe in, is a God-given right to a quarter of the planet's population to believe in it whatever way they want to believe. In any society, even a society that is not ruled by Islamic Law, Islamic Law mandates that if you are a Muslim and accepted to live in such a non-Muslim society for over three days, then you have accepted without doubt the application of the local law of the land upon yourself. Should you commit any crime that is prohibited by the law of the land, then you have to adhere to it and bear the consequential punishment for it. Should a Muslim think that such a law or laws are unfair, then he had no excuse if he lived there more than three days. The meaning here is that when a Muslim commits a crime, whether in a Muslim or non-Muslim land, he should be punished according to the relevant laws. As simple as that, the same rule applies upon any human being in general and in any civilized society.

The fact that you take one person or one group's crime whom only God knows who is pulling their strings, and who's benefiting from the "scare the herd" chaos of their crimes, and impose that upon hundreds of millions of people, is a fundamental definition of discrimination in totalitarian systems that are the opposite of the democratic and pluralistic society that the author claims he speaks for.

In February 2010, Joe Stack, an obviously unstable US citizen hater of the IRS and the US Government flew a plane in a suicide mission, slamming it into the federal IRS building in Texas, killing

himself in the process. Seventy six percent of Americans who participated in the online survey on the homepage of CNN.com declared that this was not a terrorist attack!

On Friday the 19th of February 2010, and on the popular talk show of Bill Maher on the cable channel HBO, Bill Maher asked one of his guests, "What if the suicide attack perpetrated by Joe Stack was perpetrated by a Muhammad Stack?" His guest answered with a laugh, saying, "Oh, then it would be a terrorist attack!"

When a man carrying a machine gun walked into an fitness gym in Pennsylvania, killing about a dozen people for no apparent reason but that he just chose the place, no one asks which Church he goes to, what ideology he subscribes to, and whether he was Christian, Jewish, Buddhist, or as to how Jesus (PBUH), Moses (PBUH), or Buddha's influence affected his character and shared the responsibility in the massive murders.

This is the discrimination and the propaganda of hate that Mr. Spencer is not even shy of imposing and perpetrating on the American people. So at the end, the "pluralistic society" and the democratic West would impose a fascist-like ultimatum upon their Muslim citizens and worse, on Muslims worldwide! Apparently because Mr. Spencer can poorly fabricate!
On page 191, the author writes:
"The jihadists know better. Instead, their only hope of succeeding, as slim as it is to acknowledge and confront the words and deeds of Muhammad and the doctrines of Islam that teach jihad violence and Sharia supremacism and to construct a case for the rejection of Holy Quranic literalism and the definitive discharging of these teachings."

*Mr. Spencer wants Muslims to disband their defense armies of fifty-seven countries since that is the definition of jihad in Islam, and literally discharge their entire religion and its teachings down the tubes. Should they then hope to be treated better in the next Abu Ghariab, Master Spencer?!!

How could anyone in his right mind dare to even make the request that denigrates 1.6 billion people that way, and with whose authority?
What kind of wars and clashes worldwide that such an absurd, irresponsible claim is to generate if it is brought even to minimal action.
Is the goal of Mr. Spencer and whom he represents, the clash of civilizations in itself and the trillions generated by fictitious wars, based on extreme ideas of a Western supremacy that parallels that infallible Aryan racism of Hitler Nazism?
And what is Sharia supremacy? As a Christian or as a Jew, when I believe for example that the doctrine of my religion that I belong to is the best way of life for me to live, would that mean, for example, that Orthodox Jews are supremacists as let's say the KKK or Skin heads?!

Did any of the Muslim scholars, other than the author's mystic Sufi Jihadist warriors in some cave somewhere, say that let's impose our ideology by forcing Catholics for example, to denounce the literality of their Scripture and discharge the Bible of the teachings of Jesus (PBUH), while imposing the denouncing of some basic tenets of their faith in every Catholic Church?

But that's what the author is asking to be done to the Muslims, in writing and in broad day light!

If what the author is demanding is not supremacy in its worst condition; imposing his ideology not only upon the minority within a country's grasp of its Muslim citizens, but worse, upon the majority citizens of fifty-seven countries in the world, if this is not similar or even worse than Nazism and fascism itself, then what is?

As an American, I have to warn every American brother and sister of the consequences of letting that ideology prevail and be presented as if it is a representation of the western society, for the consequences, throughout history are always the same. The German population that let Nazism speak for them is the best to tell of the consequences.

"The wolf of fascism is blind. You unleash it upon whichever group of society you target; it will still be blind when it imminently and viciously chases after you."

"What is to be done"

Here the author, without shame, puts his fascist agenda based on the illusion of the scarecrow he thought he concocted out of thin air, before we have published this book.

On page 192, he wrote:

1- "Stop insisting that Islam is a religion of peace. This is false and falsehoods are never productive."

*Mr. Spencer is stating a unique philosophy that "falsehoods are never productive"? Was he awake and conscious when he omitted entire verses of the Holy Quran, mutilated parts of them and intentionally mistranslated the rest?
Wasn't he aware that he has falsified tens and hundreds of accounts of the Prophet by bringing laughable lies of conclusions based on stories Muslim third graders know are untrue?
Even when some religion or someone claims that he is for peace - Mr. Spencer does not even qualify - why should we fight that? Is that because it's better that the same person would say I am for war, so some can start their bonanza trillion-dollar fictitious war against a defenseless small country?
The most famous rule in the American legal system is that the accused is innocent till proven guilty, while the burden of proof lies upon the plaintiffs or the prosecutor.
Every citizen is peaceful and innocent till he is proven without doubt that he is otherwise. That fundamental foundation of the "pluralistic society's" legal system is what the author wants to destroy to start his wars against Muslims. Another surprise is that this is the first thing that the author is demanding, which in itself, is clearly demanding war, no matter how many calls of peace Muslims make to the world.

The author not only wants to impose his dictatorship of brainwashing the Muslims and denying them their right to defend their lands, but he is imposing himself on even the Western leaders by asking them not to express their own opinion, and to limit what they say about Islam to only his own personal invented claims. He wrote about western leaders: "they would be much wiser to limit themselves to declaring that their foes wished to impose Islamic Sharia rule upon their countries and the world, and that they are going to lead resistance to that."!

The author a page ago, wanted to turn 1.6 billion Muslims to atheists at best by discharging the literal teachings of the Holy Quran, denouncing taking the Prophet of God and Islam as any example, yet he demands that the leaders of the West declare: that instead, it is his unknown "foes" that want to impose their ideology of Sharia upon the West!
So even if it was true, that some cave residents somewhere in the world, who are only quoted by the "selected few" in the Western media, have this crazy notion of imposing Sharia law upon non-Muslim countries and that is what the crazy jihadist warrior lunatics demand, then what is the excuse of Mr. Spencer, the civilized beacon of light of the pluralistic Western society demanding committing even worse upon the population of fifty-seven Muslim countries?!

The Sharia law, by the admission of Mr. Spencer himself, allowed Christians and Jews, even atheists to worship their religion and keep their identity intact whichever way they wanted it, and however they wanted it, as citizens in a society where the obligation was through a taxation system that was fair, objective, and applicable upon them as it was applicable upon the majority of Muslims themselves.

Compare that to the truth-seeker's statement of literally deleting the entire religion of Islam as ideology and as a practice by imposing and invoking the west against 1.6 billion Muslims.

Question of the day: define "absurdly insane" for us!

2- On page 192, he wrote:
"Imitate a full-scale Manhattan Project to find new energy sources."

Here, any psychologist would tell you that Mr. Spencer's subconscious has just told the truth. Mr. Spencer's solution to what he thinks is the problem of the West buying oil from the East and paying money for taking their natural resource is to create a nationwide program for alternative sources of energy. And out of the hundreds of the nationwide programs or campaigns that America had in modern times, like the space exploration program for example, the author chooses the secret Manhattan project that produced the atom bomb which outcome was the incineration of the hundreds of thousands innocent civilian population of two major Japanese cities! Can it be any clearer than that? I can see even theoretical fascists running to the hills from being associated with Mr. Spencer.

I am the number one supporter of alternative sources of energy, especially solar and water-produced hydrogen fuels, yet I support it for a totally different reason than Mr. Spencer's. Mr. Spencer sees the revenues of oil sales to Arab countries as a negative according to the narrative of hate-anything-Muslim, delete-anything-Muslim, and hurt-anything-Muslim. Yet even according to that well-promoted façade of what "oil money" does.

I'd like to explain to the readers some of the oil-games that are perpetrated upon the entire population of the Earth. The largest industry as far as international trade is arm sales, and no wonder when the biggest supplier of such arms is America itself, and the largest two customers out of the top three are none other than Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, who combined buy tens of billions of dollars of arms, which they never use and most likely will rust in the desert.

Aside from the rest of the Arab countries combined buying similar amounts of such arms; there is the entire preference of the gulf oil-producing area of American products and American multi-national industrial products. What even supersedes that entire systematic process

of recycling American oil dollars back again through arm sales and multi-national sales revenues in the Middle East, is that the obviously artificially inflated oil price itself is a mechanism to mob back the massive inflation pressures caused by the enormous costs of factious wars and government failed programs. These wars and waste programs are financed by printing additional dollars. Oil is traded in dollars and the higher the price of oil, the more demand for dollars worldwide, which would, to a certain extent eliminate the effect of printing trillions of dollars in debt without added asset value or true positive economic activity. These dollars are recycled back with trillions of dollars worth of arm sales and multinational corporations' Middle East revenues. Is it planned that way, I don't know, but it is the way it is.

3- On page 192 he wrote:
"make Western aid contingent upon renunciation of the jihad ideology."

All the declared aid programs throughout the West and America are for the common goals of the United Nations and mankind of alleviating suffering, supporting growth and prosperity in under-developed and developing countries within an overall perspective of supporting world peace. Here, Mr. Spencer wants to disrupt all that to impose his personal dictatorship upon countries that are in need of international support. Throughout the book, we showed beyond any doubt that Mr. Spencer had invented himself a perception of a crazy ideology that he gave the title of "Jihad Ideology", which is not only different in its entirety than the concept of jihad in Islam, but in many aspects totally the opposite. So let's say that jihad to a Muslim nation is its army of its own people, defending themselves and their national interests, like any nation in the world, which is the true case. While some crusader in the west decided, according to his invention, that jihad is a form of (let's say) cannibalism, or eating newborn babies alive, and chose an Arabic word as a title for it. Should Muslim countries then disband their armies and live defenseless, just because one man in America has the pitiful ability to boldly fabricate, blatantly lie, and believe himself?

Or maybe, one of the Muslim organizations that he claims are all led by terrorist supporters should sue him for all the fabrications and omissions of their holy book, in addition to threatening their existence in their own country, as American citizens and the future of their children.
Which country that has any sovereignty would accept aid based on imposing an ideology that literally wants to destroy its own? How would world peace and the stability of the world in its entirety be like, if fifty-seven countries that are Muslim are denied international aid or cooperation because their identity did not adhere to Mr. Spencer's little-Hitler fascism?
Would the result be, again and again and again, instability and war?
Is that where Mr. Spencer's road of fascism leads to all the time?

4- On page 193 he wrote:
"Call upon American Muslims advocacy groups to work against the jihad ideology. Instead of endorsements of the US Constitution and American values, Islamic institutions in the United States are filled with Jihadist propaganda against Jews and Christians."

Here the author uses the fascist technique of discrediting and suspecting citizens' citizenships and loyalty to their countries, and mandates only one way to validate their allegiance to their societies by adhering to an imposed oppressive system of Mr. Spencer's invention, that is neither mandated by the constitution, the law, and totally against any hint of civil rights.

And in the exercise of the McCarthyism "linked to" system of destroying people's reputations and threatening them with laughable suspicions, the author attacks one of the leading peaceful Muslim civil rights organizations in America (CAIR) by just declaring on his own - as if he is any Islamic ultimate source of truthfulness - when he said, "This is not surprising given the pedigrees of such groups, for example, emerged from the Islamic Association of Palestine, a Hamas front."

How simple a technique is that? Blow the horn about a certain hated crime and then link anyone who opposes you, or worse, that you do not

like, to that crime using the most ridiculous and absurd false accusation, to persuade the public to destroy them for you!

Here is Mr. Spencer acting his ideology in the practicality of a thug's behavior. On page 193 he wrote:
"Courageous officials and politicians, if any exist today, should challenge these groups to put up or shut up to produce genuinely moderate and reformist initiatives that teach against Muhammad's warlike example, or to stop posing as moderate groups."

Even when he amazingly asked law enforcement agencies - which is disastrous under any minimum sense of what civil rights are about, that some of our American local and national law enforcement agencies allow someone like Mr. Spencer to speak and lecture law enforcement officers, trained and funded by Muslim tax payer money that they "should accordingly stop regarding these U.S Muslim groups as trustworthy, loyal moderate who accept Western pluralism without reservation." And by the way would someone in the whole entire world explain to me on whose authority anyone can force me to believe in anything without reservation, I really would like to know!!

By that, he destroys any quality of pluralism itself, so when the citizens of any society have any reservations or suggestions about how to improve a system that more than one third of the population believes is corrupt, people are prohibited of attempting to improve or even demand the improvement of that system. So, of all American citizens, Muslim citizens, and their social organizations, even as sincere Americans, are forbidden to get involved in the politics or in the process of the betterment of their own country!
And of all citizens, they have to accept what is served to them regardless of their opinions, maybe as inmates of their own Spencer land country!
So Mr. Spencer's pluralism "without reservation", is that Muslim citizens are a "to put up or shut up" in his totalitarian system enforced - in his preference -by the law enforcement agencies!

5- On pages 193 and 194, he wrote:
"Revise immigration policies with the jihad ideology in view."

In this last demand, Mr. Spencer demands that only Muslims would be asked questions about their personal beliefs, specifically questions in the regard of his crazy jihadist Pinocchio. Some of the questions – aside from the fact that no Muslim would oppose that any immigrant to America be asked background questions, as long as they're asked to everyone indiscriminately - are:
"questions about the applicant's pluralistic societies, religious freedom, women rights, and other features of Western societies challenged by elements of Muhammad's teachings and Islamic Law."
If it is mandated upon every immigrant to be asked these questions, then every Muslim immigrant should oblige them. But here, it's not just a matter of discrimination and targeting a specific group, not only for whatever belief they may have, but for a totally fabricated baseless accusation of Mr. Spencer himself.

Within that screaming discrimination, there is another notion that we proved laughable throughout Mr. Spencer's book. Here is a quick review:

Islam opposes pluralistic societies.

Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)'s leading companions were Abu Bakr and Omar the Arabs, Bilal the black African, Salman the Persian, Suhaib the Roman, and Abdullah Ibn Salam the former Jewish Rabbi Leader, whom the Prophet not only consulted with all on a consistent basis, but applied their advice against his own opinion in many and most important occasions as well. Fundamental mandates of Muhammad (PBUH)'s teachings and Islamic Law, not only allowed or protected the rights of Christians and Jewish citizens to worship according to the tenants of their own faith freely in Muslim lands, but in itself at the time was the only resort of safety and justice in the entire world. The history of Islamic tolerance of non-Muslims in comparison to the Crusades, the Inquisition or the abhorring treatment of Jews throughout Europe in

general, is one comparison that the author can attempt to undertake at his own peril!

Religious freedom

If it wasn't for the protection of Jews in Muslim countries, there would not have been Judaism today. Islamic Law is the only religion and faith-based law that prohibits the questioning of anyone's beliefs, even openly-declared enemies of Islam.

Women Rights

Compare the size of prostitution and pornography industries that are based totally on the exploitation of women, between Western countries and Muslim countries. And while you're at it, compare mandated inheritance rights of Muslim women from every man around them, between the two camps, then compare divorce rates, domestic violence cases, and the number of victims of AIDS amongst females, then let the results be enough of an answer about true women rights, all of which are results of the blessed teachings of Muhammad (PBUH), the last Prophet of God.

While there are 6.6 million violent crimes committed in America annually, of which the pain and suffering of their victims is as sinful as the pain and suffering of any similar terrorist crime, the author wants every politician in the West to engage in the discrimination, oppression, destabilization of world peace and international trade to eventually bring a clash and optimally, according to the author, wage war against one quarter of the population, basically in retaliation for the three thousand innocent victims of September 11th, of whom five hundred were Muslim. The terrorist attack that happened under the watch of some elements of the U.S. government ten years ago, while our "pluralistic society" - that Muslims should accept without reservation - at the same time allows 45 thousand innocent Americans to die every year who are denied their basic human rights of healthcare, over 30 thousand deaths a year caused by drunk driving, in addition to hundreds of thousands of victims,

families, and hundreds of millions of dollars of economic loss due to the licensing of liquor, intoxicants, and carcinogenic tobacco products.

On page 194, the truth-seeker writes:
"If no western politicians can be found who are courageous enough to grasp this nettle, Western countries will eventually pay a stiff price, when the Jihadists they have admitted carry out successful Jihad attacks, or inspire native-born Muslims to do so – or when they advance Sharia provisions by peaceful means."

America has already paid the stiffest of prices in the history of mankind by allowing the spread of the hatred and hate-mongering propaganda of the likes of Mr. Spencer, where our US Treasury and the future of our own children were pillaged and are still being pillaged of trillions of dollars to pay for a fictitious war against a country that has never done anything to us, causing the deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians in the process, in our own name, and benefitting what I doubt to be the real employers and motivators of Mr. Spencer's "defense" contractors and oil multinationals.

On page 194 the author writes again:
"The words and deeds of Muhammad have been moving Muslims to commit acts of violence for 1400 years now."

The acts and teachings of Muhammad (PBUH) had taught the world to stand up to oppression and fight for the cause of God those who want to pillage countries of their natural resources and impose their crusading, inquisition, anti-Semitic fascist oppression that have absolutely *nothing* to do with the teachings of all Prophets of God and the true teachings of Jesus PBUH, who, on Judgment Day would be the first to renounce them and call them by their name: which is none other than "evil-doers."

Even the last sentence of Mr. Spencer's book is one of the biggest lies that you can claim about the teachings of Muhammad (PBUH)

In his most famous quotation, Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) taught:

"Deeds are judged by what they were done for, so whoever his immigration was for a world to gain or a woman to marry, then his immigration is to what he immigrated and whoever immigrates to the sake of God and his messenger, then his immigration is to them."
(Prophet Muhammad (PBUH))
Narrator: Omar Ibn Al Khatab. Reference: Saheeh Al Buckhary, Number: 3898. Degree: Correct

No Muslim ever raised the sword in the name of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) personally. He is the first to forbid it, for he himself sacrificed his entire life throughout an enormous 23 years struggle, for one purpose only: that is for the sake of the one mighty God.
It was Muhammad (PBUH), who forbade Muslims to have pictures of him, or perform even the smallest hint of associating him in any remote capacity with God Himself.
It was Muhammad (PBUH) himself who declared to his followers that no matter what they think of his good deeds, he will only enter paradise by the mercy of the One Mighty God, and not by the Prophet's own account.
It was Muhammad (PBUH) himself who declared that all Prophets of God are his own brothers and gave a trust to every Muslim who would be alive when all Muslims witness the second coming of Jesus (PBUH) from heaven; the trust is to give Jesus PBUH, Muhammad (PBUH)'s greeting of peace.

The truth-seeker's last statement was:
"The sooner this is done, the safer all will be. But as long as the manifold problem continues to be ignored, Muhammad (PBUH) will continue to inspire his followers to wield the sword in his name."!

"He preferred migration to fighting his own people. But when oppression went beyond the pale of tolerance, he took up his sword in self-defense. Those who believe religion can be spread by force are fools."

Lamartine, "Historie de la Turquie," Paris 1854

Finally:

Stealth Fascism

The latest phase of the terrifying ideology the author subscribes to is what I call "stealth Fascism!"
You are an innocent citizen or a charitable organization, which practically and publicly promote and hope for peace, yet you are Muslim, and Mr. Spencer cannot find anything to "link" you or associate you with any of his terrorist, scare crow acquaintances; what is the solution then? What can the "defensive crusader" do with the overwhelming majority of Muslims who are peaceful and peace spreading as mandated by their religion?

The solution is "stealth" allegations! That even though there isn't one iota of any proof or any hint of any wrong doing whatsoever, yet in Spencer land which makes Disney land looks like a very serious place, the evidence and the proofs are there; that Muslims in the west are plotting and are about to attack us viciously to take away our, liberty, freedom, and cookie dough Ice cream! Only it is in a "Stealth" mode.

A stealth mode that only the author and his likes can, know, see and scream, demanding persecuting all Muslims for!

In the beginning of the book I mentioned that in Mr. Spencer's eyes, "Muslims are guilty till never proven innocent"!
If you are innocent or not, you call for peace or not, an ideal citizen or not; if you have a hint of a difference of opinion, or that they cannot "link" you to any of their boogie men, then they have their patriotic undisputed "stealth" evidence ready for you, with the little caveat that it is invisible and intangible, that no one else can see, or sometimes understand except the defense contractors' patriots! After all it is the evil Muslims who have hidden it in that tricky "stealth" dimension!

So not only and as we have proven, that his Jihadist, terrorism fabrications against Islam are absurdly false, but these accusations are entirely baseless not because they are, but because only him and his

peers can see the invisible "evidence" that proves them true, hence, there are now "stealth Jihad", "stealth terrorism", "stealth warriors" who are all first cousins to Harvey the rabbit!

But I do agree with Mr. Spencer, for truly the terrorists are here, the supremacists are here, and with blunt and in your face screaming evidence, they are attempting to take over America!
Only they are Mr. Spencer and his new Fascists - stealth or otherwise - who are relentless in taking America to lower than the inhuman abyss the inquisitions have taken Europe to:
"We will torture you to death to purify you of the blasphemy you are denying, but if you confess, we will be merciful enough to drown you to death quicker; you are free to choose."!

Is the goal to deter Muslim countries from standing up for themselves against oppression, or otherwise they are stamped with the Jihadist crazed terrorist Spencer stamp? Or is it to further scare the western population into oppressing the exponential peaceful growth of Islam in the west?

"The wolf of fascism is blind. You unleash it upon whichever group of society you target; it will still be blind when it imminently and viciously chases after you."

Ask the Germans.

Moustafa Zayed

Theliesaboutmuhammad@gmail.com

تم بحمد الله

Accomplished with the blessings of Allah.

July, 2010

Index of Answers to Allegations

Muhammad and his experiences

1. Muhammad (PBUH) is a mystical historical character who is yet to be clearly fully discovered. P31
2. The incident of Surat (Al- Tahreem) between the Prophet and two of his wives. P39.
3. Muhammad (PBUH) may not have even existed. P 46
4. Muhammad's coming wasn't expected by Christians or mentioned in their Scriptures. p 54.
5. Muhammad's coming is not mentioned in the Bible. p 54
6. Muhammad boyhood was "relatively uneventful" p 56
7. Without Khadija, Muhammad (PBUH) might never have become a Prophet. P 57
8. Warqa Ibn Nawfal had known about Muhammad (PBUH)'s Prophecy for 15 years before the first revelation to the Prophet. P 59
9. There are severe and lingering challenges to Muhammad's claim to be a Prophet. P 71
10. Tales of the ancients (old scriptures), have been dictated to Muhammad. p 73
11. Warqa's confirmation to the Muhammad's Prophetic mission has been a source of embarrassment to Muslims. P 87
12. Muhammad had experiences with Christian heretical groups. P 90
13. Muhammad confused Mary the sister of Moses and Aaron with Mary the mother of Jesus. P 96

14. Muhammad had knowledge of Zoroastrian scriptures and Hinduism that he borrowed the images of Jannah from. P 97.
15. Muhammad saw the wife (Zaynab Bint Jahsh) of his adopted son and divorced her from him to marry her for himself. P 102
16. The story of Ifk, or the false accusations against the honor of Ayesha, the wife of Muhammad. P 108
17. Muhammad evidently believed the rumors about Ayesha. P 109.
18. Muhammad seems to have retreated from the claim that Israa and Miraaj was a bodily journey. P 142
19. Zaynab Bint Al Harith, who tried to poison the Prophet, was forgiven first because she said that Muhammad is a prophet of God. P 259
20. The thieves who killed the Muslim herders and stole the charity camels were killed for apostasy and not for corruption on earth. P 274
21. Muhammad's goal was to be the master of Arabia. P 309
22. On his death bed Muhammad looked to write his last advice for Muslims. P 320
23. Muhammad left no clear successor before he died. P 325
24. Was Muhammad a pedophile prophet? P 333

Muhammad and Quraysh

25. Muhammad reacted to the infidels of Qurayesh's rejection to Islam with Fury. P 79
26. Muhammad personally threatened the Pagans of Qurayesh if they didn't convert to Islam. P 129.
27. The torture that Qurayesh committed against the early Muslims was a "strike back". P 129.
28. Muhammad had anger and frustration over his failure to convert the Qurayesh pagans and threatened he will slaughter them. P 130

29. The description of Masjid Aqsa that Muhammad gave the pagans of Qurayesh as proof for the Israa and Miraaj Journey was not accurate. P 141
30. Muslim relations with the Jews dictated the Muslim relations with Qurayesh. P 170.
31. In the opening of Mecca, Muhammad had forced Abu Sufyan, the leader of Quraysh, to become a Muslim under the threat of the sword. P 266
32. Qurayesh was the reason why all other tribes accepted Islam when they did. P 50

Islam/Muhammad and War

33. Muslims were supposed to fight for the prophet of Islam, not God. P 171.
34. Muslims kill women and children at battle. P 157
35. In the beginning of the battle of Badr, Muhammad didn't expect these numbers and cried out to Allah in anxiety. P 172
36. There is a possibility that Muhammad never participated in the battle of Badr. P 173
37. The execution of Uqba Ibn Moyeet and Al Nadr Ibn Al Harith. P174.
38. Two young Muslims murdered Abu Jahl as he was walking amongst people in the battle of Badr. P 175
39. In Badr, Allah fought for the Muslims. P 176
40. Beheading hostages and war captives is an Islamic practice, then and now. P 176
41. Allah warns the Muslims not to consider booty won at Badr to belong to anyone but Muhammad. P 180
42. Muhammad was given victory by awe that is worth the rally in battle of one month. P 182.
43. The battle of Badr was the first practical example of what came to be as the Islamic doctrine of Jihad. P 182

44. In battle, Muslims are ordered to go for the kill all the time. P 185.
45. At the battle of Uhud, the Muslims were confused and fighting each other. P 198.
46. Muhammad allowed mutilations of dead bodies in battle. P 200
47. Muhammad (PBUH) had frequently insisted that Allah Himself had been fighting for the Muslims. P 201
48. The aid that God gives to his Muslim believers is "super-natural intervention" P 204
49. Muslims won the battle of the Trench by deception. P 225
50. The battle of Khaybar. P 250
51. Muhammad married Saffyah Bint Al Akhtab in the same day of the battle of Khaybar. P 261
52. The Muslims, in the battle of Hunayn, despite their superior numbers, were routed P281
53. In Tabuk, Muhammad ordered his army to attack the Roman army because they were Christians P 293
54. The first blood to be shed in Islam is when Saad Ibn Abi Waqas defended himself against intruders. P127
55. Muslims enslave war captives of women and children. P 230
56. The Nakhlah raid was a terrorist attack. P 155
57. It is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain that Islam is a religion of peace. P 348
58. Warfare and booty were among the chief preoccupations of Muhammad. P 348

The Quran

59. Holy Quranic verse numeration is not standard. P 36
60. Quranic texts are difficult to understand even when translated from Arabic. P31
61. Quran is also named Um al-kitab. P 38.

62. Quran is not the word of God because there are verses in the Quran that say (God willing). P 38.
63. The Quran is not self explaining of some of the verses and needs to have context provided. P 39.
64. Quran is a sketchy text. P 44.
65. There are some indications in Islamic history that the Quran was altered. P44
66. Quran is not the word of God. P 66.
67. Stories of the Quran are copied from Bible and the Old Testament! P 73
68. There are differences between the stories of the Quran and the stories in the Bible. P 73
69. The story of Qabeel and Habeel of the Quran is copied from the Talmud. P 76
70. Some charged that the Jews taught Muhammad the Quran. P 86.
71. Warqa Ibn Nawfal taught Muhammad the Quran. P 86
72. Many of the verses of the Quran were to manifest Allah's anxiety to grant his Prophet his heart's desires. P 100
73. The story of the Satanic verses. P 137
74. The language of the Quran is discursive and prosaic. p 145
75. The laws in the verses of the Quran revealed in Medina were copied from the Jews. P 145
76. Muhammad composed for the Muslims a brief prayer known as the Fatiha that became the corner stone of Muslim prayer. P 150
77. Quran permitted Muslim men to have sexual intercourse with slave-girls captured in battle. P 241
78. In the Quran a woman's testimony is worth half that of a man. P 338
79. The order of stoning adulterers in Islam is not in the Quran, so it is not true. P 343

80. Muhammad repented of the "satanic" verses incident. P 283
81. Muhammad received revelations through his dreams at night. P 58
82.

Male Superiority

1. The Muslim husband takes his wife as a prisoner. P 312
2. Muslim husbands beat their wives up. 314
3. Husband can do to his wife whatever he wants sexually. P 338
4. Women in Islam are deficient in intelligence and religion. P 341
5. Muslims gave a treatment of women as war prizes, with no consideration of their will, and where their previous marriages are annulled. P 243
6. Today, women are all too often treated as commodities in the Islamic world. P 245
7. The sight of an unveiled woman – to Muslims - is so distressing, so deeply sinful, that it causes even the angels to flee. P 60
8. In the Quran a woman's testimony is worth half that of a man. P 338

Muslims and Jews

1. Islam is anti Jews or Judaism. P53
2. Muhammad was strongly influenced by Judaism, situating himself within roster of Jewish Prophets. P 146
3. Muhammad continued to appeal to the Jews to accept his Prophetic status. P 161
4. There is a sharp distinction between Jewish and Islamic concepts of compassion. P 164.

5. The incident of exiling the Jews of Banu Qaynuqa. P 187

6. The Prophet of Islam directed his anger at the Jewish poet Ka'b Ibn Al-Ashraf. P 192
7. After the murder of Ka'b, Muhammad issued a blanket command, "Kill any Jew that falls into your power." P 195
8. The Banu Al Nadir standoff. P 205
9. The execution of Banu Qurayzah 'warriors.' P 225
10. Allah transformed the Sabbath-breaking Jews into pigs and monkeys. P 226
11. The three conditions offered to Banu Qurayzah were offered by the Muslims. P 227
12. The massacre of Banu Qurayzah has a source of embarrassment to Muslims. P 235
13. The mission of Muhammad was to kill the scholars of the Jews. P 52
14. Muhammad respected Jewish tribes around Mecca and sought their approval of his Prophetic mission. P 72
15. Muhammad condemns Jews to hell fire. P 348

Hadeeth and Scholars

1. There is no way to know what is correct and what is not correct of the Hadeeths. P 42
2. Hadeeth is overwhelmed with false information. P 44
3. Muslim scholars' opinions differ sharply from the opinions of some orientalists. P 45
4. Hadeeths of the Prophet (PBUH) are the Sunnah itself. P 40
5. Many incidents in the Prophet's life, including ones that became influential in Islamic history, have no supporting sources. P 43

6. Some modern scholars contend that Warqa actually rejected Muhammad p 88

Islam and Other Abrahamic Religions

1. Islam mandates a death penalty for Christian converts. P 28
2. Islam is copied from Christianity and Judaism. P 71
3. Muslims believe in Islam supremacy. P 74
4. In Islam, God was embarrassed to have his prophet Jesus die in shame on the cross, that's why Muslims do not believe in the Crucifixion. P 93
5. The nature of Jesus and his ascension to God in Islam was an attempt by Muhammad to end the conflict between squabbling Christian groups. P 95
6. Jews and Christians as sinful renegades is cornerstone of Islamic thought regarding non-Muslims. P 148
7. Muhammad was never mentioned in the Old Testament. P148
8. A Muslim should avoid Christians and Jews for the Fatiha criticizes them. P 150
9. Muhammad kept an icon of Virgin Mary and Jesus in the Kaaba. P 277
10. Jesus being son of God is a harsh accusation by the Muslims. P 296
11. The nature of Jesus and his ascension to God in Islam was an attempt by Muhammad to end the conflict between squabbling Christian groups. P 94
12. Allah told Muhammad to consult with the Jews and Christians if he doubts the truth of what he has been receiving. P 82
13. Islam asks Muslims to never befriend Christians and Jews. P 189
14. In Islam the return of Jesus is to abolish Christianity and impose Islam upon every one. P 351

15. Muhammad exhorted Muslims to fight against Jews and Christians. P 352
16. Muhammad had open contempt and hatred for Jews and Christians, incitements of violence against them, and calls that they be converted or subjugated. P 357
17. There was a conflict between Muslims, Christians, and Jews throughout the centuries. P 357
18.

Jihad

1. Jihad is holy war. P 147
2. Warriors of Jihad indeed granted no safety to those who did not accept Islam. P 284
3. Jihad of the Muslims is to dominate the world under Islamic social order. P 301
4. The September 11th, 2001 attacks were jihad terror attacks. P 330
5. The teachings of Muhammad persuade committing violence because "Jihadists" use the Prophet as an excuse. P32

Non-Muslims under Islamic law

1. Non-Muslims under Islamic law live in subjugation as inferiors under Islamic law. P 132
2. Islamic loyalty is deeper than blood. P 223
3. Jizyah is a discrimination against Christians and Jews. P 287
4. Non-Muslims are unclean because they don't eat Halal meat. P 294
5. Jizyah was Muslims' chief source of income. P 312
6. Islam forced non-Muslims not to wear distinctive Muslim men attire. 358

Islam Today

1. Avenging Insults via rioting is universally accepted by Muslims. P 31.
2. Outlawed Organizations are a representation of Islam. P 31.
3. Racism against Islam is not like Anti-Semitism. P 33
4. The Danish cartoons controversy shows the limited freedom of speech and expression in Islam. P 34
5. Saudi Arabia doesn't allow churches as a discrimination against Christians. P 311
6. The controversy between Shiite and Sunni Muslims is in keeping with the attitudes and behavior of the Prophet of Islam. P 329
7. Capital punishment in Islam is pre-medieval harshness and unsuitable for the contemporary world. P 343
8. Islam needs Islamic reformers. P 346
9. Muslims should be limited from immigrating to the west. P 351

Misc

1. The mention of Judgment day, even though it didn't happen yet. P 45
2. Allah of the Arabs is a tribal God and not the One Mighty God. P 50
3. Fitnah in the religion means seduction in the religion. P 133
4. All Muslims in Medina were not treated equally. P 146
5. Allah is ready to command what will please Muhammad. P 219
6. Hajj was a pagan custom that Muhammad wanted to make a part of Islam. P 249
7. Zayd Ibn Harithah invited the prophet to enter Zayd's home while Zayd wasn't there. P 107

8. Cutting the hand of the thief as a punishment for theft. P 347

Total allegations: 154.

Other books by Imam Moustafa Zayed:

"Muhammad Said"

www.muhammadsaid.com

To be released soon:

"Does America need Islam?"

VISIT US AT:

WWW.THELIESABOUTMUHAMMD.COM

,YOU CAN ALSO INTERACT WITH US ON:

FACEBOOK

AND ON:

TWITTER

Made in the USA
Lexington, KY
31 August 2010

They Said About Muhammad:

He was Caesar and Pope in one, but he was Pope without the Pope's pretentions, and Caesar without the Legions of Caesar: without a standing army, without a bodyguard, without a palace, without a fixed revenue; if ever any man had the right say that he ruled by the right Divine, it was Mohammad, for he had all the powers without its instruments and without its supports.
R. Bosworth Smith,"Mohammad and Mohammadanism"

He preferred migration to fighting his own people. But when oppression went beyond the pale of tolerance, he took up his sword in self-defense. Those who believe religion can be spread by force are fools.
Lamartine,"Historie de la Turquie",Paris 1854

I have studied him, the wonderful man, and in my opinion far from being an Anti-Christ, he must be called the Saviour of Humanity.
Sir Goerge Bernard Shaw in"The Genuine Islam"

ISBN 978-1453618158
9 781453 618158
90000 >